The Nation

Vol. CVIII NEW YORK, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1919 No. 2797

The Week

LIBERALS in every country scanned the dispatches with interest when, on January 22, came news of the proposed Princes' Islands conference. Now, only ten days before the date set, the success of the plan is still far from certain. The Government of Georgia has refused the invitation on the ground that Georgia is no longer part of Russia. The Kolchak Government at Omsk has not replied, but has publicly denounced the idea of an armistice with the Bolsheviki. Nicholas Tchaikovsky, head of the North Russian Government, in an interview given *en route* to Paris, opposes the conference plan, and suggests an ultimatum requiring submission of all factions to a constituent assembly under threat of international military compulsion. According to the London *Morning Post*, the North Russian Government has "forbidden the publication textually of President Wilson's proposal for a conference with the Bolsheviki for fear of the effect it would have upon the Russian population." Jean Longuet has published four questions in *Le Populaire*: First, are the Allies disposed, as a prelude to the negotiations, to withdraw their troops immediately from Russia, lift the blockade, and cease financial and other assistance to the enemies of the Soviets? Second, does the invitation to Prinkipos include only the groups which are demanding autonomy, or those fighting on purely political grounds? Third, will the Prinkipos conference discuss the peace programme proposed in December by the Soviets, particularly the part referring to the old Russian debt to the Allies, the fixing of frontiers, mining and other concessions, and commercial agreements? Fourth, do the Allies insist on Prinkipos, or would they agree to hold the conference in a neutral country, for instance, Holland or Scandinavia? M. Pichon has declined to recognize Longuet as representative of the Soviets, has refused to answer his questions, and has withheld permission to use the wireless for a reply to the Soviets. Meanwhile Lenine is quoted in an interview in the New York *World* as declaring categorically: "The Russian Government would be inclined to pay its debts if by that means the war against it could be stopped."

IN the closing years of the eighteenth century, when the nascent spirit of democracy in France was struggling, as is the similar spirit in Russia to-day, to emerge from anarchy into order amid a world of enemies, Fox urged his Government to enter upon peace negotiations with the French. The proposal aroused Burke's declining powers to a fury of opposition. "What," he cried, "you would treat with regicides and assassins!" So cried M. Pichon but yesterday, when it was proposed to negotiate with the Soviets, and the crags of Toryism in every land still reëcho his words. But recalling France's compact with Czarism one might well inquire of M. Pichon, as Fox inquired of Burke, if it were indeed his policy to "make peace with no man of whose good conduct you are not satisfied, but make an alliance with any man no matter how profligate or faithless he may be." Burke scorned the question. "This new system in France," he said, "cannot be rendered safe by any art . . . it must be destroyed or it will destroy all Europe." Substitute "Russia" for "France" in this, and you have an epitome of reactionary sentiment to-day. Fox's plea was rejected, France arose in a mighty unified effort against the armed forces of intervention, Napoleon appeared, and for nearly two decades longer Europe was an abattoir. That history repeats itself is one of the most ancient and obvious of platitudes. Yet it seems that only by a process of all but fatal bludgeoning and trepanning do the plainest lessons of history ever penetrate the human mind.

WHEN all the facts become known regarding the work of the Russian relief mission of the Society of Friends, they will make an interesting story of service rendered under exceptional difficulties. During the summer hundreds of refugees were stranded in Buzuluk by the capture of the Trans-Siberian railway, and at one time the town itself was a battle-ground for three days during an encounter between Czecho-Slovaks and Bolsheviki. Through all this the Friends' unit remained at work in the town and in the surrounding districts and villages, distributing soup to old people and children, furnishing clothing, setting up workshops, selling or giving away grain for seed and food, and encouraging medical aid. In coöperation with the Soviet Government several "colonies" were maintained in the country to care for destitute Moscow children. In Moscow, cut off by Allied intervention from the excellent crops of Samara, members of the mission have planned to secure small amounts of grain to feed the starving children. One member undertook the task of traveling through the battle area to persuade the Czecho-Slovak authorities to stop the practice of seizing as hostages Bolshevist women and children. A recent report from one of the workers states that "the action of Great Britain and America and France in Siberia and Northern Russia has made it difficult for us in Soviet territory. We are well protected by excellent Soviet certificates from personal harm or danger, but, all the same, conditions for our effective cooperation are not as good as they were. . . ." In the midst of slaughter and starvation and suspicion it is heartening to hear of a group of people who make it their business to extend "aid and comfort" to the—enemy?

OF all the peoples of the world now suffering from misrepresentation at Versailles, it is a fair question whether any is finding its views on the whole less adequately presented than is Australia. Premier Hughes has always commanded a certain respect by reason of the outspoken frankness of his imperialism, but the limitation of his ideas and the narrowness of his sympathies have alienated from him the support of liberals everywhere. Ever since he was upset on the conscription issue, shrewd observers have been inclined to wonder how truly he speaks for Australia. Among the eagles gathered about the carcass at Versailles, his voice has been one of the most strident; is it indeed the voice of Australia? The Honorable Thomas F. Ryan, Prime Minister of Queensland, who has just left our shores, denies it. In

EDUCATION LIBRARY

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

an interview published on the eve of his sailing he declared that the Australians are unwilling to have the Caroline and Marshall Islands turned over to Japan, and in a verbal statement which did not reach the press he asserted that his countrymen desire to see both these islands and German New Guinea genuinely internationalized. As between two such eminent witnesses as Mr. Ryan and Mr. Hughes we shall not attempt to decide; but we cannot help wondering how many of the selfish and war-breeding territorial claims now being pressed on the attention of the Versailles prestidigitators would be found on examination to have any more solid popular backing than the scheming ambitions of the "statesmen" who present them and the financiers who hope to reap the profits.

THE Merchants' Association has issued a statement complaining of the continued and apparently unwarranted interference with American cables and business letters to foreign countries other than those of the Central European allies. The question is a difficult one and intimately connected with the continued German blockade. At the present time France is in favor of allowing Germany certain raw materials so that her factories may be set to work and her people may earn the money necessary for the indemnity. America wants the Germans to have food to prevent a further spread of revolution and the enforced presence of American troops on European soil. England, on the other hand, cares less for an indemnity but wishes to maintain her commercial supremacy over her former German rival. Out of this conflict of interests results serious injury to the American merchant. He feels that now, if ever, is the time to introduce American goods into those markets that will soon be invaded by hungry Teutonic "drummers." For such a campaign of peaceful rivalry he has made elaborate plans. What actually happens is that his letters and cables are either delayed or stopped, or disappear entirely until such time as the matter in hand has been definitely settled. The avowed reason for this course seems to be a feeling that England's heavy sacrifices allow her to demand the continuation of London as the "legitimate market" for tin and tea and various other commodities. The American business man will hardly share this point of view.

THE ways of the State Department in the matter of passports are inscrutable. To the casual observer it seems to be uncommonly easy for various sorts of people, both men and women, who want to go to Europe for business or pleasure, and who happen to be "prominent" in business or society, to get the desired permission at short notice, and uncommonly difficult for other sorts of people, both men and women, equally prominent if in a different way, to obtain a passport without endless and vexatious difficulty, or even to learn whether there is any likelihood of obtaining it at all. The other day it was reported that the applications of certain Socialists who wished to attend the international conference at Berne had been refused; later it was announced from Washington that there had been no refusal, but merely that the applications had not been granted; still later, two of the applicants were reported to have received their passports while the application of the third was denied. Mr. Polk, who presides over the State Department in the absence of Mr. Lansing, is reported to have expressed surprise that Mr. Doheny and other oil magnates, who departed for Paris by way of Halifax because of the insufficient steamer service from New York, were going over to lay the demands of the foreign oil producers in Mexico before the peace conference; to which a representative of the oil men promptly replied that their mission was no secret, and that the State Department had known all about it from the first. The most odious features of the passport business as now administered, however, are the thinly-veiled use of passports to punish political radicals and to muzzle liberals, and the tacit permission accorded to foreign Governments to prevent the use of a passport after it has been granted. It is an outrage that an American citizen whose political views do not happen to agree with those which presumably find favor at Washington may, for no other ascertainable reason, be denied permission to leave the country; or that an official agent of the British Government, with an office in the Custom House at New York, may, for example, prevent a Russian subject from going to Holland even though he does not intend to enter Great Britain *en route*. This is not the way to inspire loyalty on the one hand or international regard on the other.

THIS would seem to be an unfortunate time for the Associated Manufacturers and Merchants of New York or any of its officers to urge the discontinuance of the United States Employment Service. Whatever its failings, the Employment Service is the only organization prepared to combat on a nation-wide scale the growing menace of unemployment. In one month, according to fragmentary reports received by the Department of Labor, the surplus of labor has increased by more than 250,000. During the week from January 25 to February 1 the increase amounted to about 55,000. The Federal Employment Service places every week some 100,000 men, a total which serves at least to lower appreciably the rate of increase. The figures alone appear to refute the suggestion of the Associated Manufacturers and Merchants that the Service is being perpetuated "merely . . . for the purpose of furnishing jobs for organized labor's business agents or social welfare folks who have been in the Government service during the war and haven't had an opportunity to tie up to a new propaganda yet." Only an employer short-sighted or unscrupulous could suggest the curtailment of any agency calculated to ease the labor situation in any direction. In the United States, as in Great Britain, labor is in no mood to endure patiently a season of hunger and unemployment. The returned soldiers are everywhere demanding that the Government which took them bodily from their homes and their work shall see that work is restored to them—good work at good wages. Pleas of a slack market or an unavoidable period of business depression mean little to men who gave their lives and all their hopes of the future into the hands of the Government. Temperamentally, Great Britain is no more subject than is the United States to an epidemic of violence and revolt. It would be well for manufacturers who seek to abolish the Employment Service and employers who look forward with satisfaction to a glutted labor market to read the contemporary history of Belfast and Glasgow.

LABOR unrest in the Northwest is apparently becoming alarming. The recent convention of the Oregon Federation of Labor was controlled by the radical element. It voted against industrial councils representing both sides as a method of settling disputes, one delegate saying: "There is only one solution. Eliminate the wage system

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and refuse to deal with the employing class." Councils of Soldiers' and Workmen's Delegates, it is reported, have been organized in Portland and Seattle. Last week 37,000 shipworkers went on strike for higher wages, and discontent among lumbermen is no less marked. Recently a labor meeting in Seattle advocating a general strike unless American troops were immediately withdrawn from Russia was broken up by the police, whose action was bitterly resented by labor. Immediately following this situation, bills directed against syndicalism were hastily introduced into both houses in Oregon and a far-reaching red-flag measure as well was put forward. Corresponding legislation has already been passed by an overwhelming majority over the Governor's veto in Washington. The syndicalist bills in the two States are practically identical. Their purpose is "to eliminate Bolshevism and I. W. W. terrorism." An opponent of the syndicalist measure in the Washington House declared that under such an act Lincoln could have been imprisoned, and according to the Portland *Oregonian* Governor Lister of Washington had also some "groundless apprehension" lest innocent persons be punished in the enforcement of the law. But Mayor Baker of Portland is less disturbed on that score. In delivering an address to the Legislature, he is reported to have said that "unless we meet this situation and put down this movement, it will put us down." We are inclined to agree less with him than with Senator Pierce of Oregon, who, in voting alone in the Senate against the bill, declared that the way to cure Bolshevism and all its manifestations is not by such threatening measures, entailing violence for their enforcement, but by making conditions of employment so favorable that the movement will die out "of its own accord," as he said. This is no complete philosophy of the matter, but at any rate it has the merit of being the most sensible palliative, pending measures of fundamental economic justice.

THE release by Secretary Baker of 113 conscientious objectors after careful inquiry into their cases is of course excellent as far as it goes. Immediate and general political amnesty, however, is the only thing that can meet the ethical demands of the situation, and remove from our escutcheon the blot of our inhumanity toward political prisoners. Moreover, only such a course can put an end to the activity of agitators—both for and against the objectors' release—who are so manifestly embarrassing the War Department. On the one hand, the National Civil Liberties Bureau points out that the release of this group of objectors only makes the continued confinement of hundreds of others, whose cases differ but slightly, seem now the more unjust. Of those who remain, one group so strongly objected to conscription that they refused even farm furlough under military control; in another group are those who objected to this war in particular, although not, it was believed, to war in general, but who have undergone torture resolutely with the rest. Senator Borah recently proposed a resolution directing the Secretary of War to furnish data concerning those tried and convicted by court-martial proceedings. This information he proposes to use as the basis of an appeal to the President urging general amnesty for all military offenders. Senator Borah's resolution serves to mark the growing demand for some show of mercy by the War Department for both political and military offenders now that the war is over. On the other hand, there are certain Republicans who are hotly attacking the action of the Secretary of War in dismissing the 113 objectors as "mischievous, unwise, unpatriotic, and un-American," declaring that the Department has thereby "placed a premium on slackerism, cowardice, and mawkish sentimentality." A resolution embodying these opinions recently passed the lower house of the Kansas Legislature. If complete political amnesty were granted, further protest would undoubtedly be raised; but with the deed effected and the question closed, such agitation ought quickly to die away.

SINCE the Senate vote on the suffrage amendment in October, when the reform fell two short of the two-thirds necessary for success, the membership of the Senate has undergone two changes that might affect the result if the question is brought up again on Monday next as proposed. Senator Benet of South Carolina, an opponent of suffrage, has been succeeded by William P. Pollock, whom the suffragists counted as a friend. Senator Drew, of New Hampshire, also opposed to suffrage, yields to Senator George H. Moses. His vote therefore becomes pivotal. Apparently not liking this responsibility, Senator Moses had the happy idea of adopting the Bolshevist theory of direct democracy. "The Senatorship," he says, "is a representative office," and in default of a referendum he would have recourse "for the determination of public opinion" to the State Legislature, "which is large enough to be thoroughly representative" and (though he did not say this) to afford to each member a reasonable degree of immunity from the unpleasant results of taking a stand either way. But when the New Hampshire House gave a majority of seventy-five for suffrage and a majority of the Senate was said to have pledged itself in the same sense, Senator Moses's convictions—or something—seem to have crystallized and the actually adverse vote in the State Senate is ascribed to his active intervention. He now considers, of course, that he has no mandate to vote for suffrage. This leaves the suffragists one vote short in the United States Senate—or two, if the latest reports that Senator Pollock will vote against suffrage are true. Unless they succeed in persuading certain Senators to alter their position, they must begin the whole weary business over again with the new Congress.

THE church, as well as industry, has its problems of reconstruction. Some thousands of the clergy have served during the war as chaplains, Y.M.C.A. workers, or Red Cross agents, giving up their parishes in many cases in order to enter the national service. For those who will now wish to resume their clerical duties, parishes will have to be found; while for those who have suffered disabling injury or whose health has been impaired, and who are no longer fit for active work, partial or complete support must be provided. An appreciable number of the younger clergy, on the other hand, may be counted upon to seek other occupation, and the problem of clerical supply, long acute in many Protestant bodies, is bound to become increasingly serious. One of the fundamental factors of the latter problem is the question of ministerial salaries, which for years, in all non-Catholic sects, have been shamefully low, and which are more hopelessly inadequate than ever in the present period of high prices. The character of church work, also, seems bound to change. The trend to what is loosely called "social service," already strong before the war, has been greatly intensified during the war. The church must look to its foundations as well as to its super-structure. It must speak a vital spiritual message.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

While It Is Day

THE dispatches from England, meagre as they are, should in our judgment be resolutely and disinterestedly considered by the minds who guide the larger operations of American industry and commerce. In view of his speech at Atlantic City some weeks ago, we especially recommend their diligent perusal by Mr. Charles M. Schwab and his associates in the National Chamber of Commerce. Strikes are many, widespread, and obstinate in all major branches of British industry. The City Corporation of Belfast has been superseded by a strike committee or industrial Soviet, "uncommonly well organized," as one dispatch admits, which administers the affairs of the city from its sessions in Artisans Hall. Important public utilities of Glasgow are controlled and administered by the local strike committee, whose power appears to be increasing so rapidly that the city looks forward with quite definite expectation to a state of things essentially similar to that prevailing in Belfast. Two hundred thousand transport-workers, associated with great numbers of railwaymen, threaten a strike which, if called, will unquestionably lock up the whole transportation system of the kingdom; and a general nation-wide strike is openly talked of as an imminent possibility. Meanwhile, considering the magnitude of these industrial disturbances, remarkably little violence and disorder have been reported.

So much, then, appears in the week's news as a *corpus vile* for editorial dissection. It is quite uniformly interpreted in our papers—and we fear by our men of affairs as well—as an undifferentiated instance of what is quite too vaguely called "labor unrest." Labor is "out of hand," whatever that means, and is running joyously amuck for more wages and yet more, shorter hours and yet shorter, and so on through the list of stock trade-unionist issues and contentions. In motive and philosophy, it is a rampage of trade unionism. We are far from satisfied with this interpretation; and certain facts outstanding in the news warrant us, we think, in asking our leading men of affairs whether it satisfies them. The London *Nation*, which can hardly be suspected of an alarmist disposition, says: "One of the gravest symptoms of our present troubles is the weakened, or lost, control of the 'authorized trades-union officials over the movements of local groups of workmen, and their growing distrust in the machinery for settling grievances as they arise in the staple industries." A correspondent of the *Daily Mail* reports that in the Belfast movement "there is no outstanding personality, but there is a capable committee of local trade-union leaders, most of whom are moderate and restrained." Yet it is in Belfast that the most radical, most nearly revolutionary, demonstration has taken place; it is in Belfast, as one correspondent acutely points out, that Ulster leaders are to-day defied by Ulstermen who were such a short while ago cemented, one would think indissolubly, by the Home Rule issue. Again, the *Nation* says:

> The enforced national unity of war-time is everywhere dissolving into furious quarrelling. . . . The growth of powerful combinations places an almost despotic power in the hands of the capitalist interests. . . . These things have been accomplished *by the connivance and, in many instances, by the aid of the state.* . . . The men turn to selfish, short-sighted, and forceful methods because they see no obviously just and reasonable way of redressing their real grievances or of attaining what seem to be fair demands.

The italics are ours. In view of the history of British labor, especially since 1909, one does not need a very lively imagination to suspect that the present movement, far from being merely an aggravated dislocation of the relations of master and servant, may be rather a way of serving notice that British labor is quite through with what the *Nation* delicately calls the "authorized" labor leader, and through with the politician. British labor has accepted and tested within the past decade about every substitutionary palliative that governmental paternalism could devise. Through progressive trade-unionist action covering a period of about seventy years, it has had the advantages, whatever they amount to, of about the very best that trade-unionism could do. Now, rightly or wrongly, it seems to have lost confidence, not in this or that Ministry or Parliament, but in any; not in this or that stripe of trade-unionist leadership, but in all; and to have come generally to the mind of the old Lancashire overlooker during the great land campaign, when Mr. Lloyd George was so busily making rhetoric do duty for action. "They're a' bl-y rogues,—one bench bad as t'other. Lloyd Jarge gi'es 'em bit o' this, bit o' that,—*where there's so much, there'll be nowt.*"

Certain observers have held from the beginning that the war was but an intercalary incident, and that the real crisis is yet impending in the contest between two theories of social organization. They believe that political and delegated government is now being put on the defensive by the encroachments of administrative and representative government, as the institutional survivals of feudalism were put on the defensive by republicanism a century ago; and that what Continental economists call the "political means" of aggregating wealth is being challenged *à l'outrance* by the "economic means." We think that the developments in England may fairly be viewed in the light of this suggestion. At all events, with the example of Russia, Mexico, and to a degree our own State of North Dakota before us, it can do no harm to study the suggestion carefully and keep it in mind. The disturbance in England may be but an *unda decumana* which will dissipate itself and subside. Yet it may very well be more; its tendency and direction, at least, may be quite definitely towards another type of social theory. Not every republican of 1789 was a philosopher or an economist; and British labor may conceivably have come into a mass-intuition that political government is *per se*, as Voltaire said, a device for taking wealth away from some and giving it to others. It may have come to distrust the state itself as an instrument of economic exploitation, an institution which exists primarily to maintain the integrity of the "political means." This idea has for better or worse unquestionably struck root over large areas of human society to-day, and the peculiar and intensive political education of the British workingman may have prepared the ground for it to strike root in England. If so, the reaction upon our own industrial community will be inevitable and definite. It can not be stayed by bayonets or by the violence of hysterical outpourings about the Red Terror of Bolshevism. Self-seeking opportunism, zealous stupidity, and ignorant fanaticism can not meet it; the politician, legislator, and doctrinaire can do nothing but mischief. The man of affairs, observing closely and studying disinterestedly—the potential Cobden—can, however, coöperate with this tendency and help to give it a wise and beneficent direction.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Immigration Bill

THE House Committee on Immigration has given its approval to a bill which, if it shall become a law, will practically suspend immigration into the United States for the next four years. The bill contains the usual exceptions in favor of Government officials, teachers, authors, artists, physicians, and travellers, and of the immediate relatives or dependents of permitted aliens or American citizens. A foreigner who can qualify as a chemist or an engineer may also come in. The only countries to which the provisions of the bill do not apply are China, the special laws in regard to which are not affected, and Canada, Newfoundland, and Mexico. If a recommendation of the Commissioner General of Immigration is adopted, Cuba will also be added to the excepted list. None of these exceptions, however, nor all of them together, will have any appreciable effect upon the volume of immigration or upon the object which the bill seeks to attain. The prohibition is aimed, not at a few thousand specially qualified men and women who may desire to practice their professions in the United States, but at the whole great body of foreign laborers, skilled or unskilled, merchants, farmers, or producers of any sort who, for any reason whatever, may prefer to earn a living in this country. All such aliens will, if the bill becomes a law, be absolutely excluded for the next four years.

It would doubtless have been possible to frame a worse bill—one with more invidious discriminations between countries, classes, or individuals, or with more drastic penalties for the violation of its provisions. But the bill which is shortly to come before the House of Representatives, with the affirmative recommendation of the committee which has been considering it, is so thoroughly vicious that it ought to be condemned both within Congress and without. At the moment when the President of the United States is sitting in conference with the heads and representatives of other Governments at Paris and working for the establishment of a league of nations and the practical application of the idea of internationalism, Congressman Burnett proposes to shut the door in the faces of the farmers, merchants, and wage-earners who may care to put internationalism to the test by trying their fortunes in America. At the moment when the legitimate opportunities in this country for industrial and commercial expansion are greater than they have ever been before, and when the economic conditions of Europe and Asia, not to mention South America and Africa, create a legitimate demand for all the food and raw materials and manufactured goods that the United States can produce, Mr. Burnett proposes to restrict the economic development of the country to the limits set by the manpower of its own citizens and of such aliens as, being now on the ground, are graciously to be allowed to remain. That the natural resources of the country ought to be developed to the fullest extent, that manufacture and commerce ought to be encouraged to expand, and that the happiness and well-being which a developed economic life may provide ought generously to be shared with all who care to take advantage of them, are ideas wholly foreign to the bill.

We object to the immigration bill in principle and in detail. Because some aliens are undesirable, all aliens are to be kept out: such is the logic of Mr. Burnett and his committee. Because Congress and the President have failed miserably in the duty of preparing for the demobilization of some millions of soldiers who will need other employment, they are to be given an opportunity to go on bungling and delaying for four years more by keeping out the foreign labor which would add to their embarassment. Because the States, having passed a multitude of laws to abate the evils of child labor, excessive hours, dangerous and unsanitary factories, bad housing, and the like, have systematically and notoriously failed to enforce them, the Federal Government is to be asked to put a stop to immigration "lest the standard of living should be lowered." All such reasoning, if it may be dignified by such a name, is as discreditable as it is unenlightened. The prohibition of immigration, whether for four years or for forty, will not add to the well-being of any wage-earner or employer now in this country; it will, at best, only give to the laborer a little more chance to go on working under conditions which he increasingly denounces as intolerable, and to the employer a little less opportunity to exploit him.

Not only is Mr. Burnett's bill the negation of the internationalism for which President Wilson has stood, and a useless nostrum for any industrial ill, but it is also open to other objections of an equally serious kind. The discriminations which the bill embodies—heritages of earlier immigration legislation of an equally unintelligent sort—are irrational and invidious. Why, for example, admit aliens from Canada and exclude aliens from Ireland? Why open the door to Mexico and at the same time slap France in the face? Why keep out farmers and mechanics, and welcome the moving-picture star who fattens on the farmers' and mechanics' dimes? Since when was the wage-earner with five dollars a day entitled to be classed as undesirable, and the chemist or engineer with fifty thousand a year welcomed without restriction? Why open the door to the minister of religion who preaches the brotherhood of man, and close it to the laymen who accept and would like to apply the doctrine? And what is the reason for the curious provision of the bill which would admit persons who have suffered for their religious beliefs, but which makes no mention of those who have suffered for their political opinions? If it be true, as has more than once been affirmed, that the purpose of the bill is quite as much to check the spread of Bolshevism and of radical ideas generally as to stop immigration, do the House Committee imagine that by keeping out people they can also keep out ideas?

The enlightened immigration policy needed by the United States rests upon a very simple principle. With the obvious exception of criminals, defectives, and paupers, and those who seek asylum in this country only for the purpose of safely hatching political conspiracies elsewhere, immigration should be free and unrestricted for all who wish to come, whether they work with their hands or with their minds. It is for the State and Federal Governments to see to it that every person within their jurisdiction, whether alien or native born, is protected against injustice, oppression, or exploitation, and that he is given, so far as is practically possible, an equal opportunity with his neighbors to return to the community in productive labor the equivalent of the support which he receives. It is out of such a society alone—a society, in other words, which looks facts in the face and does the honest thing by its members—that a true internationalism, as well as a healthy national life, can grow; but of such a fruitful development the antiquated and reactionary prohibitions and discriminations of Mr. Burnett's bill hold no hope whatever.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Poland's Travail

OF all the tragedies of the peace, none threatens to be more poignant than that of Poland. During the long century of Polish immolation, the glorious spirit of the Polish people, which would not submit to the will of its oppressors, commanded the warm sympathy of men everywhere. The conscience of mankind dictated the belief that Poland must be free. When the war broke out, it was felt that her hour had struck. A world shocked to its depths by the violation of Belgium could not be indifferent to the crucifixion of Poland.

There is no need to follow the long struggle of the four years of war, nor is it necessary to scrutinize the mistakes committed by the Polish people or their leaders during this trying time. The great and joyous fact is that Poland came out of the struggle, not only free and independent, but largely purged and rejuvenated. On the fourteenth of November last Polish independence was proclaimed, and the people's rule was established. It was in truth a people's revolution. The Regency Council, embodiment of the spirit and tradition of the old governing caste, abdicated and transmitted its powers to General Joseph Pilsudski, who formed the first people's Government. Creator of the Polish Legion that fought against Russia in the early years of the war, later a prisoner in Germany because he dissolved the Legion when Germany proposed to use it against the Allies, General Pilsudski had become a national hero, and his advent was hailed with enthusiasm throughout all Poland.

But the Pilsudski Government, though violently anti-Bolshevist, was socialistic; it even recognized the necessity of attacking the problem of great estates in Poland and satisfying the land hunger of the peasants. Popular among the people on this account, it was detested by the great landowners and the reactionaries, and it was ignored by the Allied Governments. It is obvious enough that the Polish people could freely choose their own Government only after the Germans were defeated, but the Allies months in advance had recognized the Polish National Committee in Paris, headed by Roman Dmowski, as, if not a Government, at least a body truly representative of the Polish people. The action of the Poles in setting up a Government of their own, obviously ignoring Dmowski and his reactionary following, accordingly appeared as a sort of Bolshevist impudence, and the course of the Allies was apparently shaped with this thought in view.

The Pilsudski Government was not yet denounced as an "outlaw" state, but all its appeals for food and help for the starving population were ignored. Further, the Poles were confronted with a practical ultimatum demanding that they recognize the Paris Committee of Dmowski. Ignace Paderewski, as envoy of the National Committee, made a triumphal entry into Danzig on a British cruiser, accompanied by a British officer. What happened then we do not know; for since the arrival of Paderewski the censorship has cut off most of the news from Poland. We have been told only that Paderewski is now Prime Minister and that Pilsudski and some of his followers are members of the Paderewski Government. How was the *coup* achieved? We do not know. We do not even know whether the elections announced for January 26 were actually held. Some day we may learn; now we know only that the people's Government created by the Revolution appears to be destroyed.

In answering questions in the French Chamber—questions which gave expression to the grave anxiety felt by the democratic elements in the Allied countries concerning this unprecedented dictation by the Allies to the Polish people—M. Pichon stated that France and the Allies recognized the Paris Committee as the true Government of Poland, and were using it to organize a Polish movement against German power. Thus the Allies first recognize (in Paris) a Polish Government with a reactionary policy at home and an imperialistic policy abroad; second, they compel the Polish people to accept this Government.

The counter-revolution is triumphant. The once gorgeous splendor of the Polish "Empire," embracing Danzig, Posen, Silesia, East Prussia, Pomerania, Lithuania, the Ukraine, and many other lands where the Polish language neither is nor ever was generally spoken, is looming large again. The "war of liberation" has actually been proclaimed by Paderewski in Posen. Imperialism is celebrating a great victory. The Polish Government has doubtless stopped meddling with the inconvenient land and labor questions. Instead of introducing dangerous theories of reconstruction, it is busily engaged in collecting and arming forces to fight on three fronts, to incorporate Silesia, Eastern Galicia, and Lithuania into the Empire, and—what is still more gratifying—is evidently organizing a "movement against German power." Do the diplomats dare lift the veil?

Danger Ahead

THE process of turning the thoughtful working people of the country into dangerous radicals and extreme direct actionists goes merrily on. When the Espionage Act was passed, to be followed by a long train of invasions of the fundamental principles of civil liberty, war-mad officials and their complaisant apologists in the universities and the press were loud in their assurances that while we could not defeat Germany except by Prussianizing ourselves, yet with the ending of the war we should promptly and automatically go back to the old condition in which the citizen was free to think for himself, and to express his thought in speech or writing, so long as he did not violate the law or disturb public order. It required no prophet, however, to foretell that the hatred and intolerance born of war would in due time be turned against unpopular minorities. Thoughtful critics pointed out that the weapon of suppression which officials had learned to use against dissentients would almost certainly be employed later by the holders of political and economic power against the Socialists and other thoroughgoing critics of the existing order. Exactly thus has it fallen out, and it is high time for us to realize the risk we run if the situation is not corrected.

The persecution of the Socialists did not even await the ending of the war. Our jails are full of their leaders, and the rank and file believe that they are there because of their protest against economic injustice. During the continuance of hostilities self-constituted organizations of super-patriots turned the vials of their hatred and bitterness upon the Germans, but even before the armistice was signed they began pouring them upon the "enemies within our gates"; the economic protestant was denounced as pro-German and presently as pro-Bolshevik. Then the public authorities began taking a hand. City councils and State

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Legislatures vied with one another in passing anti-red-flag measures. Peaceable Socialist parades were broken up, if not by the orders, at least with the connivance, of those whose business it is to enforce the laws impartially. Meanwhile a muddle-headed press talked owlishly about suppressing disorder in time of public danger, and men who had enjoyed the apparently doubtful advantage of a university training looked on with toleration if not with approval.

And now New York adds a new chapter to this story of preparation for a revolution. On November 26 Police Commissioner Enright was quoted thus in a newspaper interview which has never been denied:

> The police have got quite a number of owners of the larger halls about the city to agree to refuse the Socialists the use of their places for meetings. We expect to bring about a general boycott through the coöperation of business owners and lessees.

Since that time the Socialists have experienced steadily increasing difficulty in securing meeting-places. Their emphatic protests have been met by evasions and denials, and their demand for an investigation has twice been voted down by the Tammany Board of Aldermen. Now comes the Police Commissioner, in a letter dated January 25, denying that the Police Department has interfered with the individual letting of halls to Socialists, but stating that "it has called the attention of hall owners to their liability" in housing for hire illegal or seditious assemblages, or those in contravention of the Espionage Act of the Federal Government or Section 163 of the Penal Code. It so happens that the Espionage Act says nothing about the liability of a landlord for utterances in his hall, and Section 163 is aimed at "criminal anarchy"—but what is that to a Police Commissioner bent on suppressing Socialists?

Readers of the *Nation* do not need to be reminded that for a half century it has opposed socialistic dogma as energetically as it could; and it will continue to oppose it. But in the present premises it is concerned with preserving to every law-abiding citizen and organization the right to present for public consideration his ideas, no matter how erroneous they may appear. The democracy that cannot preserve that right for its minorities cannot live. It is the men who are denying that right, and not the Socialists or I. W. W.'s, who are the most dangerous enemies of the social order to-day.

For we live indeed in perilous times. Privilege in Russia and Germany has dissolved, and in Great Britain is on the brink of dissolution. The people have lost faith in their rulers and leaders. Let not our privileged classes imagine that the United States is immune. Signs multiply that precisely the same unrest is working here. Deny men the right to discuss their grievances and to redress them through changes in the law, and you develop the temper recently expressed by one of the Socialist leaders:

> I, for one, have severed all relations with the enemy. I have stopped signing petitions or other instruments of a pleading nature. I will endorse demands only. It is time that we came out in the open. . . . We must isolate ourselves—fight alone. This is the method by which we will be able to demand—not beg—our rights.

This is a spirit that cannot be put down by threats or suppression, and woe to that society in which it becomes rampant. We desire no violent revolution, and therefore we adjure the holders of privilege and power solemnly to consider whither their present course of repression leads. Perhaps it is not even yet too late.

Leisure and Aesthetics

IN the good time coming, when industry shall be conducted for use and not for profit, there is an agreeable prospect of abundant leisure. When each of us shall have done his three or four-hour daily stint in productive industry, he will have some twenty hours left on his hands that he must still get through with in one way or another. It has always been the assumption of the social prophets and chiliasts that he would devote a considerable part of these to expression of the creative instinct. Emancipated from long task-work, he would have ample energy to devote to painting or sculpture, if he were of an artistic turn, or to music, literary composition, or whatever his gift or fancy indicated; and since he would be employing himself in this pleasant way merely as an avocation, without money and without price upon his work, his creative impulses would be free from commercial control, and their expression therefore would be much more sincere, spontaneous, and abundant than now, while its survival, too, would be determined by merit alone.

There is a great deal to be said for this notion, and yet one has misgivings about too absolute a dependence upon it. No doubt there will be a great deal of self-expression in art and aesthetics, but what will it be like when we get it? That is the uncomfortable and searching question. The Russians, we hear, are doing extremely well with aesthetics under their new-found liberty; the Italians would do well, left to themselves; so would the Mexicans, and certainly the French. But these peoples have had advantages that tend to develop a sureness of popular taste in such matters, and we have not. Not for nothing have they lived in hourly contact with the best there is in this special realm. But the American and English people living, as they do, amid an unexampled external hideousness, are perhaps not quite so easily to be trusted to develop a sound and qualified self-expression in art, if left wholly to themselves. Criticism in music and literature is rising, probably, but still stands at too low a level to assure us confidently that what our spontaneous self-expression might produce would be, in the one case, worth hearing, and in the other, worth reading.

Fit faber fabricando, of course; still we think that leisure alone will not put us far on the way to perfection. Martinus Scriblerus observed that the taste for the bathos is implanted deep in the soul of man, until, perverted by custom or example, he is led, or rather compelled, to relish the sublime. Custom and example have done their work on other peoples, but among us they have done little except to confirm and strengthen the natural taste alluded to. If we employ our leisure, first of all, in inviting this beneficent perversion, in a sound study of the best models in all departments of art and criticism, we may comfort ourselves that though we ourselves die in the wilderness, we are measurably insuring our great-grandchildren's entrance into an aesthetic Canaan. But to break contact with the achievements and cultural standards of the past and boldly and busily begin upon self-expression, guided only by our natural taste for the bathos, will make the gift of leisure a dubious possession. Even the Russians reopened the Imperial Opera House, two weeks after the revolution, not with some flamboyant performance of their own devising, but with one of the most exquisite and moving of the standard operas, Rimsky-Korsakoff's "May Night."

LIBRARY
BALDWIN-WALLACE COLLEGE
LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Russia and the World

By MICHAEL S. FARBMAN

FOR more than a century Russia was the bugbear of the world. Since 1812, when the *Grande Armée* perished in Russian snows, the tradition of Russia's invincibility has been firmly established. "Russia is invincible, and woe to those who try to conquer the Russian giant"—that became the guiding idea of Russia's foreign policy and the basic principle in the relations between Russia and the world. This conviction of Russia's invincibility was the background of Russia's backwardness; it stimulated and nourished the predatory instincts of Czardom, encouraged the covetous expansion of Russia's imperialism, and resulted in the ill-fated isolation of Russia and her exclusion from the economic and political development of Europe. And while the fear of Russia and her isolation stimulated the predatory policy of Czardom, the insolence of that policy contributed still more to the fear and hatred of Russia throughout the world.

Russia was hated because she was feared. It is almost an impossible task to give an adequate idea of the intense contempt and hatred felt for Russia by Western Europe in the middle of the nineteenth century. Russia was denounced as the enemy of civilization and the classic country of Asiatic cruelty; Russians were depicted as an inferior race, as barbarians of the most ferocious type, who not only lacked culture, but who actually reacted against culture and civilization. Russia's expansion was watched by all European states with the greatest anxiety and apprehension. Her real or alleged designs against the peace of the world were carefully and diligently counteracted.

A radical change in Russia's relations to the world came soon after the Franco-Prussian War. Threatened, as she was, by a new war from insatiate Germany, France in her desperation turned her eyes to the Russian barbarians. Thiers's appeal to Russia was historically a momentous fact; it radically changed Russia's status in Europe. Previously the potential enemy of every country, Russia now became the potential ally of France, and out of this situation grew the Franco-Russian Alliance—the most fateful political combination of the nineteenth century. It was a simple and ingenious idea; instead of being afraid of Russia's might—use it. And yet an alliance with Russia was so strange, so opposed to the idea of Russia that was common to all European peoples, that it was almost twenty years before the bashful and uncertain *rapprochement* between the two countries could be openly proclaimed as the Franco-Russian Alliance.

For a century the democratic elements in almost every country had been used to look upon France as the foremost leader in the struggle for progress and democracy. But more than in any other country was France admired by the progressives of Russia. France was the dream and the ideal of several generations of Russians. They have grown to love and worship free France. Their struggle for freedom was always associated with the glory of France. To them France was the symbol of liberty. It was always "glorious France, liberty-loving, free, and revolutionary France." It is easy to imagine how painful it was to the Russian democracy to discover in later years that the spirit of free revolutionary France is a matter of the past and that the France of to-day is too largely permeated by chauvinist dreams, imperialist greed, and reactionary instincts. It was the more painful to them because they were conscious that this betrayal of France was brought about by the very alliance with their own country. To the Russian democracy the Franco-Russian Alliance was a double blow: it strengthened the national and international prestige of Czardom, and it weakened the democratic tendencies of France.

The Franco-Russian Alliance was indeed a strange union. On the eve of the alliance Russian students and revolutionists had been massacred by the police for singing the Marseillaise in their secret meetings; and then suddenly the Marseillaise was played by the very bands of the gendarmes during the gorgeous festivities ushering in the new alliance. The people went through these celebrations half terrorized by the thought that the Marseillaise played by soldiers under the protection of the police could not be real, and yet the shouts of *Vive la France* seemed to herald a new epoch in Russian history.

The Russian liberals were hopeful and proud beyond measure; an alliance with a republic, an alliance with revolutionary France—it was almost a revolution in itself. And coming at a time of the darkest reaction at home, this alliance, they believed, would lead Russia to progress and prosperity. They were confident that the French were truly "our allies." The disappointment came very soon and it was the more painful to the Russian liberals, because the French made it unmistakably plain, that they contemplated an alliance with the Russian Government—not with the people. France was unfortunately "their ally," not "ours."

With the Franco-Russian Alliance the international position of Russia cardinally changed. Up to that time Russia had moulded her own, though predatory, policy. From the time of the alliance up to the Russian revolution, Russia became a means—an instrument—in the policy of others. That the revolution was at first unable to force a recognition of Russia's right of "self-determination" is one of the greatest misfortunes that have of late befallen Russia. With the conclusion of the alliance Russia went through a period of praise, of recognition, and indeed of flattery. It was no more the backward, poverty-stricken Asiatic country of ferocious barbarians; it suddenly became the land of proverbial, though undeveloped, wealth; it was populated by vast millions of kind, good-natured, religious, and industrious people, called by the strange but sweet name "*mujik*." Russia's tyranny was replaced in the imagination of her French allies by a kind of patriarchal family, headed by a tender, peace-loving ruler, who, though an autocrat, was rather a "little father" than a dictator to his people.

The discovery of Holy Russia had not yet taken place. As a matter of fact, this ingenious discovery followed the *rapprochement* between Great Britain and Russia several years later. This theory not only justified but virtually

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

glorified Czardom. With all their sugary revelations about the mysterious Russian soul, which for its spiritual perfection needs the triple curse of Czardom, poverty, and darkness, and with all their pretended love for the darkest bigotry and for the most unholy aspects of Russian life, the discoverers of Holy Russia paid her the most doubtful compliment ever extended to a living nation. And yet up to the revolution this Holy Russian school held the field in the Allied countries (though not in the United States, where Stephen Graham and the other priests of Holy Russia were not in particular favor.) The practical result of these efforts to whitewash Czardom was the beginning of the incessant flow of French money into Russia. There began an era of industrial expansion, a period of unsound and rapacious exploitation of Russia's wealth. The enormous profits made by native and foreign capitalists, and the prosperity of the rich in the principal cities of Russia, stimulated still more the flow of foreign capital to Russia and contributed greatly to the legend of her unlimited power despite the disaster which overtook her in the Russo-Japanese war.

This miscalculation of Russia's strength was one of the most extraordinary illusions of our time. It was also one of the most fatal. The ignorance of Russia was both misleading and amazing. The Russian army, thoroughly unsound, was believed to be one of the most formidable fighting machines in the world; Russia's economic inferiority was no better understood. Hence at the outbreak of the war Russia's position in the alliance of the democratic nations was symbolized by a steam-roller, which was to crush the enemy and appear triumphantly before the gates of Berlin. Only ignorance coupled with contempt could have inspired the image of Russia as a steam-roller. Only a fatal miscalculation of Russia's strength could have led the Allies to expect military marvels from a bulky but thoroughly unhealthy Czardom. And yet this belief in Russia's unlimited strength was so great that when, after three years of continuous terrible hammering, Russia at last lay prostrate; when her industry was completely exhausted; when the army, which had fought for three years under conditions beyond human endurance, at last gave in; when the whole social and economic fabric had passed into a state of rapid and elemental dissolution—even then there was no sympathy with the Russian people and its sufferings.

To the world Russia was and remained only a means—not an end in itself. For the Russian people the revolution was the greatest end and the highest dream, which had at last come true. But to the world the transformation of a vast human ocean into a free people was but an incident in the war. The Central Powers received the news of the Russian revolution with bestial joy, hoping that a great adversary would soon lie prostrate; the Allies greeted it with apprehension lest it might weaken the anti-German coalition. The Allies refused to recognize the fact that Russia's elemental disintegration was the dreadful price she had to pay for three years of war waged single-handed on the easern front. The very fact that Russia had spent the last atom of her moral and physical strength in holding the line against the enemy, while the Allies were getting ready, was considered a crime for which there was no mercy. And when Russia, after seven months of unprecedented struggle against dissolution, was obliged at last to recognize that she was defeated (in fact she had been defeated two years earlier), the attitude of the Allies toward this tragedy of a people was expressed by the merciless word "treason."

Lately, however, it has become almost a fashion to plead for Russia and publicly to recognize her great services to the Allies. Even the most respectable newspapers and magazines, which not long ago were prominent in the campaign demanding invasion of Russia as punishment for her treason, now publish letters to the editor or even editorials pointing out that Russia saved the Allies during the first two years of war and that the Allies in their triumph should not forget their indebtedness to Russia. The greater part of these letters and editorials, to be sure, conclude their plea for Russia with a demand that she be encircled with a ring of bayonets, starved out, or else invaded on a much larger scale—but all out of sheer gratitude to Russia.

I am not advocating invasion or starvation of Russia, either in punishment for her "treason" or in gratitude for her help. Nor do I desire to plead for Russia. I only wish to point out that among the many manifestations of national self-denial revealed to us during this war, none is more remarkable than the fact that Russia remained in the war from the March revolution up to November. If Russia saved the Allies it was certainly at that time. Nobody knows what would have happened had Russia quit the war six or seven months earlier than she actually did.

The history of these seven months of torture and suffering, when Russia, in a process of rapid and elemental decomposition and with all her national interests imperatively dictating peace, subordinated her own safety to the safety of her allies, remains a story of the highest spiritual achievement ever attained by any people. It was the spirit of the revolution which gave new Russia the moral power for this great deed. The revolutionary democracy was conscious of the danger to Russia and to the revolution, and many calls for help were sent the Allies warning them of the critical situation. Although these pleas were unheeded, and although the vilification of the revolution greatly embittered the struggling Russians, they nevertheless remained true to their conception of duty to the Allied cause. Conscious that Russia was nearing the abyss and branded by the Allies as traitorous because it was unable to resuscitate Russia's fighting strength, the revolutionary democracy yet stood to the very end.

It is easy to suggest that it should have stood longer. I should like to believe that other, more stubborn peoples, with higher moral sense of duty than the Russian, would have sacrificed more completely their own people and their own interest for the happiness of mankind. The Russian people, indeed, might have struggled even longer against death and decomposition. But only under two conditions; first, the revision of Allied war aims; second, the rejection by the enemy of a non-imperialistic peace. These conditions certainly could not have resuscitated the Russian army, but they might still have galvanized it into further activity for some time. The appeals of Russia for a revision of war aims, alas, were ignored—and after what we know at present about the secret treaties we realize that they could not have been heeded. Thus Russia was allowed to fall to pieces. Yet when the Russian people—a virtual corpse at the end of 1917—dropped out of the war, the fate which awaited it was the fate of a traitor. Thus the past. Let us now turn to Russia's present relations to the world.

Once more Russia is the bugbear of the world; once more she is denounced as the foe of mankind and the enemy of civilization. Again she is accused of menacing the peace of the world. This time, however, it is not the dominions of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the neighboring countries which are threatened by her, but the very foundations of the existing social and economic order. Our entire culture and civilization are said to be at stake. Hence the cry, raised from one side of the globe to the other, that Russia must be subdued if the peace and the civilization of the earth are to be safe. This gloomy picture of a world threatened with destruction by a new and formidable enemy cannot be dismissed as simply the fancy of a frightened imagination. There are many substantial and weighty proofs that the danger is real.

Let us admit that the reports of the spread of Bolshevism are greatly exaggerated; let us further admit that the vision of Lenine and Trotzky conducting a world revolution from isolated and actually beleaguered Russia is too theatrical to be true. Yet one thing seems to be established beyond doubt and that is that the Russian Bolshevist Government is theoretically, and so far as possible practically, preoccupied in encouraging revolution in the neighboring countries and is busily engaged in organizing Russia for a fight with what is called "world imperialism." None the less, I hold it thoroughly false and misleading to accuse Russia of fostering world revolution. I assert with the utmost confidence that this revolutionary propaganda was a desperate act of self-defence on the part of revolutionary Russia.

I do not mean to say that Trotzky, Radek, or other Bolshevist leaders are inspired solely by the desire to defend revolutionary Russia. I willingly admit that they are heart and soul for a world revolution at any price. I am even ready to subscribe to the extreme conception that some of the Bolsheviki would rather sacrifice Russia than give up the idea of the Socialist revolution. But it is not a question of the motives of single persons; it is a question of the motives and aspirations of millions of common people, who certainly have not the slightest desire for world revolutions. It is a question, not of Lenine or Trotzky, not even of the Bolshevist party or the Soviets—it is a question of Russia. The problem is not why the leaders of revolutionary Russia were heralding a German, and at a later stage even a world revolution; the question is why millions of simple folk, peaceful toilers and peasants, were dreaming of and praying for a revolution in Germany; why these hungry and tired people were ready to defy the whole world. The answer is simple. It is because Russia and her revolution were menaced with destruction by German militarism, and because they are still menaced by the landlords and reactionaries who are inviting foreign troops to crush Russia and to rob the people of the great gains they have made.

Indeed, after the March revolution the thought of a revolution in Germany became the uppermost *national* aspiration of Russia. It was a passion, which obsessed the workers and soldiers of Russia. The Russian revolution, they felt, would never achieve its objects, unless there was a revolution in Germany. Nay more, without a revolution in Germany the Russian revolution was in vain. It would inevitably be crushed and the Russian monarchy reinstated. And the more the disintegration of Russia and the decomposition of the Russian army progressed, and the more cynically German imperialism behaved, the more passionate the longing and the hope for a German revolution. In fact, only that, it was felt, could save Russia. At the time of Kerensky's fall, when Russia was completely worn out and Germany was hovering over her like a gigantic bird of prey, the idea of a revolution in Germany became a question of life or death to Russia. I mean this statement literally and not in any figurative sense. The Bolsheviks and Mensheviks, the Socialists and non-Socialists, the soldiers, workers, and peasants—all had become aware that free but disorganized, starving, and ruined Russia, without any army and with all industry destroyed, would be an easy prey to imperial Germany. And the only thought, the only hope, was a saving revolution in Germany. Without a revolution in Germany Russia and her revolution were lost. That was beyond doubt or question. And the real difference between the several revolutionary parties of Russia amounted, after all, only to the method for bringing about the revolution in Germany. The Social Revolutionists of the Left would prolong the war, because, according to their conception, the most effective revolutionary propaganda is achieved by revolutionary bayonets. The Bolsheviki evidently relied more on propaganda by speech and leaflet. After all, it may be that Lenine's famous "peredyshka" (breathing space) was more than a clever evasion by a shrewd politician.

It is only natural that every people should defend itself with whatever weapons are available. France and Russia both need "securities" from German aggression. Each country has its own set of means to achieve that end. France would annex or neutralize purely German territory, take away the control of iron and coal, take over battleships, guns, airplanes, and ammunition, and dismantle German fortifications. Revolutionary Russia was too weak to force such a bold programme of securities. Many of us believe that even if new Russia had sufficient power to enforce those securities, she would remain true to the principles proclaimed by the revolution and abstain from annexations and indemnities. Others on the contrary assert that victorious Russia would have spoken the same victorious language as was used by victorious France and would have made the same victorious demands upon defeated Germany as victorious Germany made upon defeated Russia. But it is of no use to indulge in speculations of one kind or another. Let us stick to the facts. Defeated Russia could consider only one set of securities, one kind of defence, namely, to strike at the militaristic spirit of Germany. Having no force to destroy the German military machine, revolutionary Russia made every effort to undermine the foundations on which this machine was laboriously built up.

It is not true, and it could not be true, that Russia is populated by Bolsheviki who above all desire a world-wide revolution, and are ready to starve and to die for the success of world Bolshevism. No! the Russian, as any other people on earth, has only the desire to be allowed to work out its own salvation. The position of the Russian people is desperate, and its methods of defence are desperate. But even now, when the eleventh hour has long passed, a solution of the Russian problem seems possible. And this solution, so far as the principle is concerned, is given by the declaration of the Supreme Allied Council in Paris.

As soon as the world is willing (1) to "recognize the absolute right of the Russian people to direct their own affairs, without dictation or direction of any kind from outside," and (2) "recognize the revolution without reservation and in no way and in no circumstances aid or give countenance to any attempt at a counter-revolution," then the Russian people will throw away its guns and ammunition and its dangerous revolutionary propaganda. Only absolute non-interference in Russian affairs and recognition of the revolution will give Russia the chance of self-determination.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Striking of Clocks

By NATHAN HASKELL DOLE

MANY persons of means have all their clocks kept in time by a specialist, who appears once a week, winds them, sets them, regulates them, and at proper intervals oils them. To any one of well-coördinated habits it must be a satisfaction to hear every clock in the house striking twelve at exactly the same instant and to know that the Sun himself is not more punctual in reaching the zenith; that the astronomer-general, or whatever he is called, in Washington, or the winking chronometer on every observatory in the country, is not more reliable.

The householder who so implicitly trusts a hireling to attend to his timepieces loses the real pleasure which arises from personal contact with his clocks, just as he loses an intimate relationship with his surroundings if he permits a professional decorator to take entire charge of furnishing his rooms or an expert to buy his pictures and statuary for him. It may relieve him of any suspicion that his ignorance of Art and of congruity may make him ridiculous; by trusting his own routine he may occasionally reach an engagement a bit early or a bit late, but such adventures add to the zest of life.

I confess that I enjoy the moment, Sunday mornings, when I feel it incumbent on me to attend to the clocks. I get out the step-ladder so as to reach the broad face of the kitchen clock; I stand on a little stool which enables me to turn with proper solicitude the somewhat worn apparatus of the ancient tall clock, a family heirloom, which once kept time for my grandparents in their country house and must remember many interesting events. I try to make it say "Forever-Never," like Longfellow's, but it insists on a dignified tock-tock, more like talk-talk than any philosophical hint at the flight of time. Occasionally the piece of catgut on which the heavy weight is suspended will fray away and break, and then I have to rob a 'cello of its C-string, or summon the clockmaker. When the weight falls in the middle of the night, it is indeed startling—one wakes thinking of burglars.

Another very dignified-looking family clock, of much smaller size and with a gold decorated mahogany case, stands on a bracket which has to be carefully poised each time it is wound; otherwise its ticking becomes erratic like a heart with valvular trouble. When first wound, it strikes with peculiar vivacity, and its ticking keeps repeating the word, "Don-key, don-key." By concentrated attention I can hear it say other dissyllabic words, but its normal utterance reflects a certain disdain expressed in that disparaging epithet—and I am altogether too willing to apply it to myself.

Then there is a fine old French clock of black marble, rather funereal, but with a silvery thin bell, suggesting that it is a lady's voice speaking. It does not have to be wound every week; it runs for nearly three weeks; but lest I should miss it and discourage its excellent habit of keeping correct time, I take it in my regular rounds every Sunday morning unless I happen to forget the duty, as happens occasionally since I am not a creature of fixed uniformity. I often recall with amusement the story of the old farmer who wound up his eight-day clock every day for fifty years before he discovered that he had wasted all that energy; but I have never learned why a clock should be timed to eight days, a period which has apparently nothing to do with any division of the months or the years. Perhaps it is on the same principle that the French exemplify when they call a week *huit jours*, though meaning only seven, and thus misleading too literal translators. I never had any ambition to own one of those silent, mysterious clocks with a circular disk which almost make a complete revolution and then return on themselves—clocks that keep on for a whole year without attention. And I look with mingled feelings of admiration and dismay at a friend's ormolu clock which is housed under a glass canopy as if imprisoned in a big, permanent soap-bubble, so fragile that a harsh voice would shiver it. Such objects are beautiful, but never meant for nomad people or for houses where there are children. The glass cover, tall and iridescent, has to be lifted every time the clock is wound, and thus there are fifty-two major risks every year, to say nothing of the carelessness of maids with brooms and dusters. If I had a big house, I should want a clock with cathedral chimes to stand in the main hall; there is something very delightful in the snatches of a tune taken up every quarter of an hour and then made complete when the hands have gone the full cycle, the tune followed by the deep boom of the bell. Such clocks are not meant for cottages or small apartments; they are not exactly domestic and *intime*, but rather formal and overpowering, distant and grandseigneurish, with perhaps a smack of the *nouveau riche*, which is never to be detected in "the grandfather clock," however well preserved.

For the chamber I like the handy travelling clock in its morocco case and always ready, if it feels the little button touched, to repeat itself. I still regret a somewhat expensive one, stolen from a large room overlooking the Grand Canal. Whether an agile gondolier climbed up and made away with it or whether a polite chambermaid, coveting its melodious note and its glittering brass and glass, managed to abstract it under her apron is a moot question; it vanished mysteriously and is probably still keeping time in the beautiful city, no sane sojourner in which has ever been known to care a straw about the time of day, unless it be about the dreaded moment that shall, all too soon, call him to less enchanting climes.

Clocks, by the way, are generally called she in the country. I remember a kindly little woman in a seashore village, who, in speaking of the noisy timepiece which clung desperately to the dining-room wall, boasted: "She's a master hand to keep time." It seemed to me something like calling a man-of-war or a big tom-cat by the same feminine pronoun. Men especially are inclined to personify what they affect—violins (as in "Robert Falconer"), ploughs, jack-knives; but I should have thought that a woman would make a clock masculine; we never imagine Time as anything else than a Father—Father Time. The Germans, who make the Sun feminine and the Moon masculine, speak of *die Zeit*, however; how they reconcile it with Father Chronos, it is hard to see.

To return to the striking of clocks: it is rather confusing to have them all announcing the hour synchronously; it is difficult to tell what time it really is. I much prefer that they be allowed a little leeway, or, rather, since it is not well for a clock to have the third hand, I mean the Behind-hand, to have all but one of them, the best timekeeper, for instance, to be four or five minutes fast, so that each shall express her individuality, and if I perchance happen to be absorbed in my work and do not notice that one has struck or what one has struck, I can be reassured by

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the reiterated clang of their bells. I often perceive that church clocks differ materially in their exactitude, and that is a comfort, because, just as their creeds jangle more or less, so do their bells, and there is nothing more profoundly symbolic than the discords which shatter through the air of a Sunday morning when they are all bidding for their congregations to assemble. Perhaps the day will come when there will be some attempt to get both the faiths and the bells into better tune; it will probably be easier to do in Germany, where all the metal was commandeered to make explosives.

I have known one or two persons who have directed their acquisitive instinct to the collection of clocks. For me, one clock to a room is sufficient; I should be distracted by having the noise of a clock-shop going on all the time, though I have heard it said that, just as a harmonious husband and wife in the course of fifty years grow to look alike, so do two or more clocks tend to tick in unison. I do not altogether believe the yarn, for machinery has very little "give" to it, and if the tendency exists, it meets the stern exigencies of unyielding metal and is obliged to curb its sympathies.

I have noticed one thing peculiar about clocks—they always strike as if they were going to continue striking, they strike with the rising inflection. Perhaps when each strikes for the last time, the last note will indicate that the Day of Doom has come. On that day the great *clepsydras* of Nature, the rivers and the brooks, will stop marking the intervals of Time, the tides will no more rise and fall, and there will be the vast eventlessness of Eternity.

The Shop Stewards' Movement

BY A SPECIAL CORRESPONDENT

THE peculiarity of the present strike movement in Britain consists in the fact that it was not authorized by the trade unions. It is a typical "rank-and-file" movement, and is evidently brought about in defiance of the union leaders. We are apparently witnessing a struggle for control of the labor movement between the old trade unions and the shop stewards. The British Government seems to share this opinion; for according to dispatches from England "the problem in view of the Government Ministers is how to reëstablish the authority of the trade unions."

The ascendency of the shop stewards is striking; for the movement is literally in its infancy. Fifteen months ago but few persons, even in England, knew anything about it. The shop stewards' control first came into prominence in November, 1917, during the big strike in the munitions factories at Coventry. The object of the strike was to obtain recognition for the shop stewards' committees of the various works in the district. The demand was first made in a single plant, at which there has been recrudescent trouble for a long period. It was refused by the management, on the ground that the whole question of recognition was the subject of negotiations between the firm and the official representatives of the union. The consequence was a strike in this establishment; within a week it had become general throughout Coventry. The situation there greatly alarmed public opinion, because the vital airplane industry was tied up, and the Government hastened to settle the strike. The shop stewards' committees were recognized in the engineering trade. The conference for the settlement of the Coventry disputes showed clearly that the recognition of the new movement was a deal not between the workers and the employers, or between the latter and the State, but between the rank and file and the trade union.

Shop stewards are by no means entirely new functionaries in the British labor world. As a matter of fact, shop stewards have always been the agents for the trade union branches (the smallest units of union activities). But the rank-and-file movement, which has loomed so large in the last year and is known as the shop stewards' movement, has no connection with the old union shop stewards. As an organization, it is doubtless a product of the war, and it has come into prominence under pressure of the war. But the adherents of the new movement assert that the shop steward idea was developing for many years before the war. They are confident that had there been no war, the shop stewards' organization would sooner or later have come to grips with the trade unions, and finally supplanted them. They maintain that the industrial reaction against the futility of the doctrine that economic power can be acquired primarily by parliamentary political action (a doctrine extremely popular with British labor for the last twenty years) had become evident before the war. In spite of the great triumph of political labor, which at the outbreak of the war was safely intrenched in Parliament, economically British labor was weaker than before. While capital gained enormous power under the flourishing conditions of British industry, labor made no corresponding gain. The exaggerated hopes of Parliamentary successes, which ran high after the election of 1910, soon gave way to disappointment and depression, and the idea that industrial power is the real expression of working-class strength gradually grew in popularity. The new shop stewards' movement was the accumulated expression of this idea. But it could only come to a head when the war demonstrated the weakness of trade unionism and made the shop the unit of industrial activity.

The effects of the war on political, economic, and cultural conditions have been so enormous and so deep, that years will pass before we can grasp all the tremendous changes in the psychology of men and the conditions of life. Perhaps the most important change and the one which will have the most far-reaching consequences and the greatest influence in the struggles for a new social order, is the change in the opinion of men on the respective necessity and usefulness of the laborer and the capitalist. The war demonstrated the indispensability of the laborer to the state, while the idea of the state's need of the capitalist was considerably shaken. It was not only the self-respect of the workers that grew. High tributes were frequently paid them by the public at large and even by their antagonists. The London *Times* repeatedly during the war praised the "splendid cohesion and steadfast resolve of the workers of Great Britain." "At every crucial stage in the war," said that great Tory organ, "the great organized labor movement of this country has been ready to subordinate its own preferences, privileges, and plans to the national end." On the other hand, it cannot be denied that the prestige of the capitalists underwent a sharp decline. The capitalists have been accused of "incurable selfishness," even by the middle classes. The working class went farther: it directly charged the capitalists with "exploiting the national crisis for profits." Grave as was this decline of moral position and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of prestige, much more important and far reaching was the demonstration by the war of the incompetence of the capitalists to manage industry at a time when the life of the state was largely dependent on the achievement of industry. The state was compelled to intervene, to take over control, and in many instances even entirely to eliminate the capitalist management. This action was bound to make a tremendous impression on the workers, who were, moreover, permeated by the proud consciousness of their own supreme necessity to the state. The workers began to look upon the capitalists as a drag and a hindrance, and easily visualized the industry of the future as a compact between labor and the state.

In the beginning there had been no change in the relations between the state and labor, but at the beginning of 1915, when the first munition crisis led to an appreciation of the true character of the war as an "engineer war," labor was invited by the Government to coöperate with the state in the conduct of the war and in the production of munitions. This departure was hailed as a new chapter in the history of labor. When in April, 1915, the North East Committee on Munition Supply was set up, on which the trade unions had seven representatives, the London *Nation* called it a revolution. In fact it was a tremendous novelty in the life of both state and labor. The trade unions were recognized as the spokesmen for the working class; they were summoned to special conferences; they secured representation upon Government committees and tribunals; they received and gave pledges. But all this recognition did not make the working class more powerful. On the contrary, labor had to forego rights and safeguards that had been gained by tenacious efforts in former years. In a few short months the British working class was deprived (with the concurrence of its leaders) of all trade union rights and customs—of the rights to strike and even of the right to enforce workshop discipline.

There were plenty of signs that the rank and file was not content. Every new demand by the Government led to more articulate outbursts and protests from the ranks of labor. In such cases the Government hastened to summon the trade union leaders and gave new, or repeated old, pledges to restore trade-union conditions and customs after the war. The union leaders, pledged on their part to an undeviating and unconditional support of the Government, sprang to its assistance, and through suasion or threats always succeeded in weathering the storm. Conscription, munition legislation, leaving certificates, dilution, conscription of labor—all those demands were at first indignantly rejected by labor. Yet, supported by the trade-union leaders, the Government was able to push them through. However, the resentment of the workers could not be combated; it grew in intensity and steadily accumulated, not so much against the Government as against its own leaders. Gradually this resentment turned into alienation and almost animosity. Such was the psychological environment for the growth of the shop stewards' movement.

Contributors to this Issue

MICHAEL S. FARBMAN is the American representative of Maxim Gorky's paper, *Novaia Zhizn.*

NATHAN HASKELL DOLE is one of our best-known translators and the author of many works on literary subjects.

Foreign Correspondence

On the Eve of the Conference

Paris, January 13

"IT'S a regular national convention of Americans," remarked William Allen White as he stood at the Place de la Concorde and beheld the never-ending stream of Americans passing back and forth. Paris is truly flooded by Americans; on the Rue de Rivoli one sees more American uniforms than French, and the prevailing language is so little that of Paris that the humorous are already suggesting that signs reading "Ici on parle Français" should be placed in the shop windows. There are really too many Americans here, far too many for Paris, far too many for their own good. As Bishop Brent said in his sermon yesterday, the French hearthstone has been trodden upon often enough these last four years; it is time strangers got out and left the French a bit to themselves.

But Americans are not the only ones here; every other nationality is represented on the streets. And then there are pitiful delegations of Lithuanians, Poles, Russians, Dodecanesians, and heaven knows how many more—pitiful because they seem so helpless, so at sea, yet so intensely bent upon somehow getting their case before the Allies and obtaining quick action. Quick action! With a Peace Conference not yet getting down to business; with the preliminaries not yet settled, with postponement after postponement and hope deferred making the heart sick; with the most difficult of problems in Poland, Russia, and Germany pressing for settlement or decision, and somebody postponing the Conference every day—Wilson, Clemenceau, Orlando, one after the other! Mr. Wilson's departure for home is only four weeks away. Men may die by the thousand and women and children starve if you please, but the Conference must be postponed.

But there are others here who impress me far more than the Americans and the English and the Italians and the groups representing all the new nations who have so suddenly been born into the world, some, perhaps, to die a-borning. When I stand upon the streets and see the long rows of captured German cannon, ghastly in their war paint, and behold the grateful helplessness of their silent captivity, I can only see and think of the dead who fought these guns and the thousands who fell when they belched forth. What of these dead? When I vizualize them I have a deep feeling of pity for Mr. Wilson. He has tasted a popular acclaim given surely to no other man in history. The honors bestowed upon him here in Europe are such as have certainly come to no one else, for they have come from the hearts of the people, who more and more are turning to him as their one hope. Yet how can any one envy him? Upon him rests the most terrible responsibility. The liberal opinion of the world declares him its spokesman; the plain, usually voiceless, people of Italy, France, and England have found speech to cheer him as they have never cheered any one before. From across the Rhine, the ignorant, deluded, beaten Germans look to him as the one man who may secure to them a future worth while. What if he disappoints victors and vanquished alike? I know that if he fails it will seem to all liberal thinkers in England as if the blackness of utter desolation and hopelessness were settling down upon the world. And what will the dead say? That thought

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

will never down. Here in this city, in that heavily over-ornamented Louis XV room in which the Conference is to meet, will be decided whether the dead died in vain or not; whether this was really the war to end war or whether that phrase was the merest cant and hypocrisy. Is it any wonder that in these hours of maddening delay, of ignorance on the part of all the press representatives here as to most of what is going on, one thinks ever of the ghostly legions which must be marching up and down the Champs Elysées and mounting guard over the palace where sleeps Woodrow Wilson?

No one knows to-night all that is happening except a few insiders. Much they may be putting through, the little group of men who rule the world, but they alone can measure how much. I am told, by one who should know the truth, that the real business is being accomplished in these informal meetings; that when the Peace Conference meets it will be really only to record decisions, and that until the behind-the-scenes decisions are ready the Conference will mark time. "Open covenants of peace, openly arrived at!" What a mockery the phrase sounds here! Yet it is true that the position of the maker of that phrase has steadily improved during the last two weeks. His trip to Italy strengthened his hand enormously; the people simply could not be kept from him and there is no doubt that they worship him. The danger is that they really believe that like some magician he will produce for them, out of his hat, an entirely new world. It could be done, heaven knows. It could be done right here in Paris, here and now, in the year 1919. But we must be content, they tell us, with half a loaf—and happy if we get as much as that. The fear is that a *bon mot* of one of the Paris newspapers which runs, *"Après la guerre du droit, la paix du tigre,"* may come true.

We shall see what we shall see. Outwardly things are not going well. Mr. Lansing is not cutting a good figure before the correspondents; he fences in the daily parleys, instead of taking the men into his confidence, very much as he used in Washington, and there was a regular *émeute* at his conference yesterday. The English correspondents one hears are similarly unhappy; of our own, many are suffering from nostalgia and are eager to get home. Their restlessness is due not to the fact that they are not getting news to send out, but that they are not getting vital news to send out to the American people. They have become very eager to win the President's battle for him, but they are fearful that if they are not given the information they need they cannot prepare the ground in America in time for the seed to fall on fertile soil. It is interesting to see how these men have grown more liberal as they have become more and more familiar with the forces opposing the league of nations. They are beginning to realize, many of them, that the creation of the league is rightly the first thing upon the programme, not only for its own intrinsic value, but because of the necessity of having an instrument with which to deal with the vast number of problems of which Mr. Wilson in his address at Manchester declared that neither the Peace Conference nor any other single group of men could grapple with all at one time. They are despondent just now because the details of the President's plans for the League are not being given to them, and many of them believe that there is no such plan. In this they are mistaken unless my information is entirely at fault. Even some of the French press speak of the President's withholding his plan for strategic reasons until the Conference opens—perhaps to prevent concerted attacks upon it in advance.

But while the press correspondents are thus unduly concerned for reasons that do them honor and reasons over which they have no control, it is undeniable that the situation on the eve of the opening of the Conference is in some aspects a serious one. The note of M. Pichon of January 5, replying to the wise and sensible request of the British Government that the Allies invite all the parties to the Russian struggle to send representatives to the Peace Conference, rejected that humane proposal in language so vigorous and so violent that the reply of the other Allies is awaited with some anxiety. Again, there has been an unfortunate publication in *l'Humanité* of a statement on Poland given by Mr. Lansing in confidence to the American correspondents. It is not only that the publication appeared, but that it appeared in a newspaper hostile to Clemenceau under circumstances that made it seem as if it had been deliberately given out by our commissioners. More than that, it was a flat denial, in unqualified terms, of the inspired report published apparently by the Supreme Command, i. e., General Foch, that the Americans have agreed to invade Poland with the Allies. Any further use of such emphatic language by either side will undoubtedly engender dangerous heat—all the more dangerous because there is not that cordial spirit between the fighting forces which one had been led to expect, and which ought to exist. The war for justice, for liberty and civilization, is having some curious results!

But while the above report of the actual conditions on the eve of the fateful gathering sounds discouraging, the truth is, as I shall cable to the *Nation* this week, that the situation is not actually so discouraging as it has been. Four weeks ago the outlook for sanity on the Russian situation seemed dark indeed. Now it can be stated authoritatively that all danger of American as well as of British intervention in Russia is past. That is in part due to correct thinking and proper political instincts; it is also to be credited to the march of events. The recent sensational statement of the Swedish correspondent of the London *Times*, that the Lenine army is no longer a Bolshevist army but a Russian one, well armed and well officered and commanded by one of the ablest officers the old army produced, has put statesmen on notice that the task of unseating the Bolshevists is one to call for bloodshed on a large scale and for an expenditure of treasure which the United States alone can supply. We cannot expect to hear of the immediate withdrawal of our troops from Archangel because it is inaccessible now on account of the ice. But the Vladivostok troops may be homeward bound sooner than people at home expect.

What the Allies will do in that unhappy country nobody yet knows. It is quite possible that there may be some British and French military interference there. What the Lithuanian Committee is here to ask is that some twenty thousand American Lithuanians in Pershing's army be released to them, and that plenty of arms and ammunition be given to them as well—and while they seek audiences with the powers that be to obtain this and other help, the Bolsheviki are sweeping through the Lithuanian country at a rate that makes it obvious that it will have been overrun long before adequate military aid can arrive there. The difficulty of aiding Poland is increased by the fact that there are two would-be Governments of Poland, one of the Polish

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Committee in this city, which the French Government favors, and the other that under General Pilsudski, which has actually governed for the last two months under very trying circumstances. Again, there have been signs there as well as elsewhere that when you create a new state you are not thereby necessarily cleansed of all imperialistic ambitions.

The magnitude of the problems and their multitude are simply overwhelming. What of Persia, what of Albania and Syria and Armenia, and the three new republics in the Caucasus about which the American Commission to Persia has just brought authoritative information to Paris? One hears very little of them all. Mr. Wilson is rightly concentrating public opinion upon the league of nations, after which the question of disarmament ought to come to the fore. Too many men have been taught the use of deadly weapons, too many soldiers have learned the advantage of indirect attack, to make the world very safe for either democracy or autocracy at present. Certain monsters have an unhappy way of turning against their Frankensteins.

OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD

Our Weekly Cable Letter

Marking Time at Versailles

Paris, January 31

THE skies and omens continue favorable in this second week of the Peace Conference and we are assured of a third and interesting meeting on Saturday. While it is as hard as ever to obtain precise information, it seems to be agreed that Wilson has scored another point in winning the English agreement to the principle that all German colonies shall be treated as wards of the league of nations. While there may still be many a slip between cup and lip, and it is not yet clear that Lloyd George has won assent, it is evident to the correspondents that the American authorities are immensely pleased at the progress made. Wilson himself is reported to have shown his teeth at Wednesday's conferences as he had not done since his arrival and to have let it appear that there are times when he will fight. Lloyd George is not so happy as he was and is complaining that the Conference is slow and that he cannot see as much of the President as he would like in order to make things move. But if it be true that Wilson carried his point yesterday it marks a new era in the history of the backward nations and ends the possibility of dividing as spoils the captured German colonies. If so, it will be one of his greatest achievements.

We are still witnessing a curious spectacle—the doing of much of the work of the conference by bodies not officially connected with or having authority to act for it. It is rumored that Lloyd George was quite disconcerted when Wilson went on the committee to work out the detailed plan of the league, fearing he would be still more engrossed, but the committee has not as yet met. It is explained that sometimes these things can be as well done by informal conferences as by committee meetings. Yet so much depends upon the details of the scheme that it should engross all the time of those entrusted with the overpowering responsibility of creating it. We are still without an American plan for a league and are informed here that for strategical reasons no American plan as such will be given out. On the other hand those who have seen the English plan tell me that it is brilliant and extremely well worked out in its details. Whether this will be made public or whether a composite of all the plans will be laid before the conference for approval is not clear. But evidently there is no intention of using the American press to educate people in the details of the scheme before it is sprung upon the world. The uncomfortable fact is that the Conference is moving slowly and so much in the dark that public interest in its work may wane.

The growing unrest in various nations is reflected in Lloyd George's own feeling of impatience. Thus the British delegates to the Berne Conference (which despite difficulties bids fair to be an extremely interesting meeting) showed great concern, when passing through Paris, over the labor situation in Great Britain, notably in Glasgow. They say many capitalists will hold back the making over of plants or the taking up of new lines until they know the outcome of the Peace Conference. Meanwhile there are endless strikes and there is considerable unemployment. This is playing into the hands of the direct actionists. While greatly pleased that the Peace Conference is taking up international labor problems they fear that any action will have too much governmental flavor, especially since George Nicoll Barnes and Mr. Gompers will have so much to do with it. The report that President Wilson has ordered Mr. Polk to behave himself and be sensible in the matter of granting passports to non-governmental American Socialists gave great satisfaction here, but this is dampened by the additional gossip that Wilson has ordered Mr. Gompers to attend the Berne Conference, where he is not wanted. Indeed there are few non-governmental places where he is wanted. In the main, therefore, most nations are more encouraged this week.

The English camp, however, is somewhat discouraged and some therein begin to have doubts as to whether a peace conference representing only one-third of Europe can make peace for all of Europe. They are discouraged, too, lest the Prinkipos conference fall through. The leading Paris representative of Lenine and Trotzky is confident that the Bolsheviki will attend, now that the Archangel Government and other opposition groups have declined. It is gradually agreed here that the choice of a meeting place was not happy. What will happen if Prinkipos falls through no one seems to know. But the soldier opposition to more fighting is not waning. The conservative French press still openly opposes Wilson, being quite against his colonial policy. This, however, was Pichon's week for blowing hot and his interview with the correspondents with its implied rebuke to Foch was quite satisfactory.

What the people at home must realize is that the battle here will not be won until the final documents are signed, and no one knows when that will be. Meanwhile they must content themselves with general assurances that things are moving as well as could be expected considering the personalities and problems involved, and the curious method of transacting the real business outside the Conference. There is still sharp conflict of opinion, for there are plenty here to share Lodge's view that the league should come after peace instead of Wilson's opinion that it should come immediately.

OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD

LIBRARY
[illegible] COLLEGE
LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the Driftway

THE candlelight fell on the gleaming samovar, the red roses, and the strong features of a white-haired woman; and on the eager group before her. A movement at the door caused a little stir—and an old man, slight and fragile, approached the speaker. A young voice near her cried joyously: "Babushka, dear, it is George Kennan!" The old woman rose and faced him—and clasped him in her arms. What a meeting! When they had met before, Catherine Breshkovsky was a political convict in Siberian mines. George Kennan, through his early writings on Russia, gave her to the world, and now, after she had been mourned as dead (with her obituary sadly penned in many lands), here was George Kennan to give her to the world again. America and Russia in each other's arms—was it prophetic or only reminiscent? Was it simply the old Russia and the old America? Would the accord be as true between old Russia and young America, or young Russia and old America; or even between old and young Russia? Generations are as hard to span as international boundaries. Amid the hopes fulfilled disappointments rankle. The Revolution for which Babushka lived, and which found in George Kennan such a sturdy apostle, came to pass—and ran away, after the mad wont of revolutions. In Russia Babushka still finds many sorrows. And in the great country of liberty, whence George Kennan had come as a messenger of hope—Babushka finds other sorrows, echoes of old Czarist days.

* * * * *

TO those who dwell upon the heights the little people of the valley are often obscured by fog. Those giants of the old revolution, Breshkovskaya, Kropotkin, Tchaikovsky, and Lazareff (who in old age have seen the fruits of their vineyards ripen and wither), are solitary snow-capped peaks, venerated afar by the jostling pygmies seen dimly in the clouds below. Perhaps when the vapors melt before the sun of peace it will be seen that what seemed confusion below is after all wholesome activity. Babushka's viewpoint of affairs Russian and international differs widely from the *Nation's*. But though minds differ, hearts agree, and her chief interest, as ever, is in the welfare of her people. So now it is the millions of orphans of the war whom she would mother. Her eager old face lights up with that heart-compelling smile as she plans the work she would have her American friends help her to do—a farm community—school teachers—a nurse—tools—a store—and books, books, books—the model rural settlement is all pictured in her mind and in the minds of her hearers.

* * * * *

THE Drifter pondered as he walked homeward through the quiet streets. After nearly fifty years of crushing hardships and repression, this woman of seventy-five, who had endured the bitterest depths of solitude, and the highest acclaim of her nation, had now journeyed across Siberia, the Pacific and this continent, travelling at full speed, overwhelmed at every port and station by eager multitudes—here she was, vigorous as a man in his prime. And when near midnight the Drifter who had crossed the continent to welcome her kissed her hand in parting, the Little Grandmother caught his hands and danced round the room as lightly and merrily as a child.

THE DRIFTER

Trees in Winter

By JANE DRANSFIELD

Gaunt ribbed, they stand against the winter sky,
And with thin fingers trace their loneliness.
Gone is the fulsome ease of lush July,
And fallen is the sheen of summer's dress.
The tattered leaves that here and there yet sway
Upon their branches are as parchment dry;
Whirled by the wind they crackle to decay.
The solitary figure of the crow,
Who makes the woods more lonely with his cry,
Sole tenant is of these bare boughs of grey,
Casting his sable shadow on the snow.

Departed is the season nonchalant:
The leafy fascination is no more,
Which lured the little birds to nests and song.
Now naked aspens tremble as before
A judgment. Nature has grown old and stern,
Forbidding Pan to pipe, and locking streams
In silent bondage, where they cannot turn,
Nor laugh, but stay their course as if in shame.
Even Iris is too cold to carry dreams.
Yet deep upon secluded altars burn
The fires of Spring, with unawakened flame.

Correspondence

Is "Open Diplomacy" Practicable?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: May I call to the attention of the *Nation* the service it would render to its readers by presenting its conception of what open diplomacy would be in actual practice. The *Nation* has been in the forefront of those who through constant agitation have endeavored to secure this priceless blessing now in the gift of the Allied statesmen. Yet out of all the agitation has appeared not one plan indicating how open diplomacy is to be carried on. The children of this world know and seek after the fruits of this world; but the children of light, with no commonly accepted and understood definition of what they are seeking to obtain, dissipate their strength in fruitless contention over an as yet empty idea. The very press representatives were reported thrown into confusion when in response to their protest against the proposed rule of secrecy at the sittings of the peace conference, they were asked to suggest a definite and workable plan for reporting them.

And well they might be. For how *is* open diplomacy to be carried on? It is agreed that so far in the preliminaries of the conference we have not had it. Some have said that it is not yet time, others that the cause was being lost. Either view, by open statement or by assumption, recognizes that there may be private conversations between diplomats and yet no "secret" diplomacy. Yet such conversations may easily become the bases for the most pernicious forms of secret diplomacy. But when, and who is to be the judge? A verbatim report of the recent conversations between Wilson and Orlando over Italian aspirations and the Jugo-Slavs would make interesting reading, but it may well be questioned whether such reports with the popular clamor they might provoke would make for a more just settlement than the present private conversations and public addresses, with their delicate phrases but stern meanings, and the immensely important commentary of the reception given them by the public. And at the peace conference, would the case for

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

genuine non-interference in Russia gain by a publication of all the facts available, including, for instance, the part played by Soviet differentiation between the French and other foreign debts in forming the attitude of the Allied Governments to the Soviets? Would those imperialists who oppose the reality of a league of nations, while they give lip service to its name, be deterred from their proposals to disarm all the world but themselves, by having to risk through publicity the condemnation of an enlightened, because war weary, people? The astonishment which greeted Lloyd George's proposal to treat with the Soviets, and the acclaim given to D'Annunzio's recent tirade about *Italia irredenta*, must give pause to our hopes. And one begins to wonder if it might not be for the best to have the entire proceedings secret, provided the results are made public and submitted back to the several nations for consideration, ratification, amendment, or even rejection, much as might be done in this country should our Senate so choose to exercise its power. But once so much is allowed to secret methods, does it not become exceedingly doubtful if public interest can be relied upon to resist the tendency to accept a settlement simply because it is a settlement, and to arouse itself to examine critically the results of its best representatives, and if necessary to force a reopening of a period of doubt and unrest in international affairs, by that time exceedingly burdensome? With such difficulties and such grave questions so easily raised, the advocacy of a concrete solution is essential if only to guide discussion and to bring out constructive criticism.

HOWARD D. ROELOFS

East Aurora, January 25

The Question of Indemnities

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Mr. Lloyd George's belief that indemnities can be collected from Germany without injury to Allied trade will hardly be shared by the working classes. Germany can pay only in goods, displacing Allied labor in the process. The indemnity policy puts resuscitation of Germany's economic life ahead of Allied reconstruction. It means supplying Germany with food, raw material, and machinery, and restoring her foreign trade. But the worst feature of the policy is the necessity it involves of intervening in German politics for the advantage of the industrial magnates and the Junkers. These elements must shoulder much of the responsibility for the war; they should be punished, not favored. Our indemnity policy necessitates going to their support, because the German democracy in the early stages of its power will be industrially less efficient than the old system. Exorbitant wage demands will cut heavily into profits, and political instability will shut off foreign credits. Intervention on the side of the old régime is the only thing that can avert these consequences.

The Allies are faced with the alternative of sacrificing their indemnities, or sacrificing the democratic results of the war in Germany. They ought to sacrifice the indemnities. Nothing should tempt them to interfere with the salutary, if somewhat alarming, progress of democracy in Germany. The temptation to restore the military dictatorship, for the purpose of guaranteeing the subjection of the German workers while the indemnities are being paid, must be resisted.

Principle and expediency alike suggest the wisdom of letting Germany solve its own internal problems. It will have to do so eventually. The introduction of a foreign factor into the equation cannot permanently control the result, because the foreign force will some day have to be withdrawn, and the situation left to the play of the factors native to it. Why not frankly admit that we cannot levy tribute upon Germany, and at the same time assist her progress in democracy? Let us not throw away the substance of victory for the shadow.

ARTHUR PERCY CHEW

Chicago, December 21

New Crimes

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: After a careful examination of the list of sixty-two "traitors" and "pro-Germans" recently presented by our unsurpassed Army Intelligence Department I have come to the conclusion that in America it is now a high crime and misdemeanor:

(1) To display any interest in plans for social betterment.

(2) To believe in free speech or to resent its suppression.

(3) To give any intelligent support to President Wilson's ideal of a League of Nations.

(4) To make any practical effort to apply the ethics of Christ to present-day political and economic questions.

(5) To have studied in Germany.

(6) To believe that peace is ordinarily preferable to war.

If the courts see fit to recognize these rather extraordinary new criminal definitions we may soon anticipate a condition quite similar to that of Russia under the Czar, when a prison sentence was almost the only reliable guarantee of a man's honesty and intelligence.

WILLIAM HENRY CHAMBERLIN

Brooklyn, January 30

Imperialism in the Garb of Democracy

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Mr. Ernest W. Clement, in his letter to the *Nation* of December 28, describes the present-day polity of Japan as "imperialistic democracy." Then he quotes, in support of his thesis, a statement by a Japanese publicist in the *Japan Advertiser*.

In the first place, we must bear in mind that practically all utterances made in English by Japanese statesmen and publicists are manufactured for export purposes, not for home consumption. Secondly, instead of taking all Japanese statements at their face value, as the western public has generally been doing during all these years, we must consider if there is any consistency, even in a remote way, between their professions and their practices.

All well-wishers of Japan earnestly hope that Japan will become a democratic nation; for that will be a blessing to Japan and a boon to all Asiatic nations. But as yet there are no encouraging signs of democracy in the Sunrise Kingdom. Japanese statesmen are liberal in their internal administration, but decidedly Bismarckian in their foreign policy, as has been conclusively demonstrated in their absorption of Korea and in their recent aggressions on China. Their political motive seems to be, contrary to their repeated professions, Asia not for Asiatics but for Japanese; and what they tell the western public is diametrically opposed to their practices on the Asiatic mainland. It is well to remember that in Japan militaristic imperialists, including such powerful men as Marquis Okuma, General Terauchi, and Baron Shibusawa, control the influential press and the various industrial, financial, and political powers of the country. Although in many of the domestic affairs of their Government these men have differences of opinion, there is ever a unity of purpose in foreign policy relating to Greater Japan.

I am happy to acknowledge that there is a handful of men in Japan who passionately cling to democratic ideals, and who are willing to advocate the principle of "government with the consent of the governed." These men opposed the annexation of Korea and the aggressions of Japan on China. But they are persecuted and their activities suppressed by the Government. Japan has a splendid opportunity of becoming teacher and leader in the Orient. Instead of fulfilling this mission, she is assuming the rôle of a conqueror, incurring the hatred of Asiatics and the suspicion of western nations. I, as a sincere well-wisher of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Japan, earnestly hope that the present democratic movement all over Europe may make a profound impression on Japanese leaders, in order that they may abandon their Bismarckian imperialism and Machiavellian diplomacy, and make of Japan a real democratic nation. Until then, the Japanese polity is not "imperialistic democracy," as Mr. Clement describes it, but rather imperialism masquerading in the garb of democracy.

HENRY CHUNG

New York, December 30

Addenda

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The new Sherlock Holmes, so fittingly characterized in last week's *Nation,* is, after all, I fear, but an amateur. His list of dangerous citizens is strangely curtailed—did his imagination fail him, or his courage? Had he completed his Augean task his list would probably have included, among others, the following:

Nicholas Murray Butler, President of the American Association for International Conciliation, Red Eagle of the Second (not first) Class from the late lamented William Hohenzollern, chief manager of the Carnegie slush fund for peace.

Elihu Root, associated with the above pacifist and his assistant in the Carnegie peace work.

James Brown Scott, of the Carnegie Peace Foundation.

A. Lawrence Lowell, surreptitiously associated with the League to Enforce Peace.

W. Howard Taft, also said to be associated with the said League to Enforce Peace, formerly connected with political activities of a suspicious character.

W. T. Manning, reported to have said recently "Blessed are the meek for they shall inherit the earth."

J. D. Rockefeller, jr., who spoke on "Brotherhood" at Atlantic City, and failed to exclude the Germans by name. Therefore "suspect."

T. W. Wilson, formerly a professor in Princeton, once suspect because he is reliably reported to have said that we should be neutral, that he was too proud to fight, and that he should be thanked for keeping the peace (also reported to have congratulated the late W. Hohenzollern on his birthday). Now somewhere in France and under suspicion of being a member of the League of Nations Association.

POOHBAH II

New York, February 1

Tales That Come Out of Russia

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Recently in Russia, three noblemen, after repeated warnings, were executed for flagrant violations of the law. When an American, who was there at the time, reached London, the story had grown into a "massacre," and the number had expanded to thirty. Some of the similar tales that appear in our dailies have that satisfying and well-rounded quality peculiar to the best fiction, and are readily recognized as such, whereas others have the still more perfect art that conceals art, and, like Defoe's History of the Plague, have a versimilitude which true stories of the occasion could hardly hope to possess.

In these days it is so difficult to know what to believe—all of which brings me to the American public's debt of gratitude to the editors of the *Nation,* who, by publishing translations from the Bolsheviki edicts, enable us to understand the temper of the men and women back of them, and to judge for ourselves the probability of some of the opera bouffe deeds laid to their credit by a venal press.

MARGARET LENTE RAOUL

Navesink, January 30

Literature

The Phelpsian Way with Recent Poetry

The Advance of English Poetry in the Twentieth Century. By William Lyon Phelps. New York: Dodd, Mead & Co. $1.50.

PROFESSOR Phelps's book on recent poetry is quite different from Miss Amy Lowell's "Tendencies in Modern American Poetry" of 1917. She selected half a dozen twentieth century poets, typical and American; he handles half a hundred poets, miscellaneous and Anglo-Saxon. She, under the title of "Tendencies," endeavored to trace out a main line of advance. He, under the title of "Advance," does not endeavor to trace out even the main tendencies. The tendency toward central pessimism, consequent upon the dissolution of Victorian beliefs; the exceptional pressure of naturalism, experienced as a fetter by some poets and as a wind of God by others; the specific veins of relief, fresh courage, or fresh beauty which the actualistic poets are opening in the plain surface of life; the groping of the mystical poets for renewed spiritual wholeness; the imagistic tendency of style, which is by no means confined to the Imagists proper, and the counter endeavor to revive the singing quality of verse: these and other tendencies are sporadically glanced at by Professor Phelps, but not grasped and thought through. His grouping of his chosen poets is extraordinarily whimsical. He puts together Amy Lowell and Anna Branch, both being women born in New England; then come Mr. Masters and Mr. Untermeyer; then come Sara Teasdale and Fannie Stearns Davis, both being women born in 1884. Here and there, batches of minor poets whom the author deems worthy of passing mention are tossed in without context. In short the book's coherence lies mostly in its Phelpsianism. But here, too, lies its inescapable charm. Mr. Phelps has an immense delight in poetry, and in living; and he has the art of projecting that delight, through hypodermic sentences, into the veins of the average reader. That reader will generally approve the particular verses which the writer chooses for comment and citation. What though the fastidious may groan when Mr. Phelps praises Bynner's "Grenstone Poems" and leaves out "The New World"; when he highly recommends the verses of Alan Seeger and is only slightly interested in John Drinkwater and Fannie Davis; when he lauds "The Barrel-Organ" of Noyes and fails to mention E. A. Robinson's "Ben Jonson"? Such preferences are compensated by a host of incisive and healthy opinions like the following: "He [D. H. Lawrence] is surely better as a looker-on at life than when he tries to present the surging passions of an actor-in-chief. . . . He should change his gear from high to low; he will never climb Parnassus on this speed, not even with his muffler so manifestly open." The reader becomes a healthier and a joyfuller man.

Our only important criticism of Mr. Phelps is that he sometimes makes a gesture of authority which is not justified in the sequel. Is this, mayhap, the only ill effect of being a professor that Mr. Phelps has not succeeded in entirely avoiding? At any rate, such gesture is misleading to the wide audience whom he has won through the written and the spoken word, and is likely to exert upon their tastes just that restrictive effect which Mr. Phelps is mainly anxious to avoid. For so unconventional and receptive is his prevailing attitude that when he makes unhesitatingly a very inclusive or conclusive statement the hasty reader is likely to accept it without parley. The following assertion, for example, is misleading when placed in the preface of such a sketchy work as the present: "I have endeavored to make clear the artistic, intellectual, and spiritual significance of many of our contemporary English-writing poets." From a sentence like this one's eye inevitably travels up-page to the unfortunate word "advance" in the title.

By way of preliminary definition, the author asserts at the outset that every year witnesses a "natural and inevitable advance

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in poetry." Accordingly, "Wordsworth was not great enough to have written King Lear; and Shakespeare was not late enough to have written Tintern Abbey." But why not render the illustration pertinent by saying that Masefield is not great enough to have written "In Memoriam," and Tennyson was not late enough to have written "The Everlasting Mercy" (both poems presenting a religious conversion)? And in his chapter on Masefield, which is one of the most thorough and effective in the book, why not give a clear demonstration of this "natural and inevitable advance"? The author remarks that in contrast to Tennyson "Mr. Masefield is at his best in the fierce conflict of human wills." He does not explain that for Masefield, as for many twentieth century poets, the word "will" means simply overmastering desire, while for Tennyson it meant preëminently that which controls desire. To be sure, he remarks that "reserve and restraint were the trump cards of the Typical Victorian, just as the annihilation of all reserve is a characteristic of the twentieth-century artist." And in comparing Tennyson's "Enoch Arden" with Masefield's "Daffodil Fields," he notes that the one "celebrates the strength of character, the other the strength of passion." But he concludes, dubiously: "It might be urged that whereas Tennyson gave a picture of man as he ought to be, Mr. Masefield painted him as he really is." As he really is, then, man *may* be a characterless bundle of strong desires? No doubt in his heart of hearts Mr. Phelps does not believe so. But again, he says that Francis Thompson, "profoundly spiritual" and "aflame with religious passion," is a close kinsman of the religious poets of the seventeenth century, without noting that something of the same "natural and inevitable advance" which characterizes Masefield's dramatic vein appeared in Thompson's mysticism too. Sometimes the author raps the knuckles of recent poetry rather severely; and he is continually animated by the frank desire to avoid, as he puts it at the beginning, "the mistake of despising the giant Victorians." But he leaves the reader with no firm notion as to why some knuckles, gigantic or diminutive, should be soundly rapped, and others warmly clasped and kept hold of. In brief, the author's judgment in this matter of poetic advance is for the most part hazy or in abeyance. His difficulty is that, pulled one way by a red-blooded up-to-dateness and the other way by a warm-hearted piety, he is not looking for the highway that runs between. Is this condition, so far from being peculiar to Mr. Phelps, a widespread feature of American culture? Well then, considering the width of his influence, we fancy that Mr. Phelps could render something like a national service by devoting a little patient, investigative thinking to the matter of the aforementioned highway. At least, he should suppress the gesture of authority with which he sometimes waves his readers to a by-path as though it were the main road.

Earl Grey the Fourth

Albert, Fourth Earl Grey: A Last Word. By Harold Begbie. New York: George H. Doran Company. $1.25.

THE subject of Mr. Harold Begbie's memoir, the Earl Grey who died in August, 1917, was the fourth holder of the earldom, which dates back only to 1806. The first earl was a soldier, and as a general was in command of British forces during the revolutionary war of 1776-83. The second earl was premier of the Whig administration that carried the reform bill of 1832 through Parliament. The third earl, uncle of the Earl Grey of Mr. Begbie's memoir, has a place in English history by reason of the part he played in the abolition of the corn laws and the adoption of free trade in 1846; also from his tenure of office as Secretary of State for the Colonies in the Russell administration of 1846-51; for his share in framing the constitution of 1850 for the colonies now comprised in the Commonwealth of Australia; and for his continued and strenuous but entirely futile efforts while he was at the colonial office, in the critical years of 1846-51, to secure uniformity in fiscal legislation, based on the principles of free trade, for the British Empire.

Albert Grey, the fourth earl, was a Whig member of the House of Commons from 1880 to 1886. As a young man at St. Stephens, he enjoyed the friendship of Gladstone, who had been associated with the third Earl Grey in the free trade legislation of 1846-50. He was for a year administrator of Rhodesia, and was Governor-General of Canada from 1904 to 1911. But he was never in the front rank in political life at Westminster. It is doubtful if he would ever have reached the treasury bench; for he was only loosely attached to the party system, and was possessed of qualities not helpful to the making of a strong partisan. Moreover, neither his services as administrator at Bulawayo nor his long term at Ottawa secured for him a place in the political history of the British Empire comparable in any way with the places long ago accorded to both his grandfather and his uncle, or with the place that must be accorded his distinguished cousin, Viscount Grey of Falloden.

But it is not claimed by Mr. Begbie, nor indeed by any of the friends or associates of Earl Grey, that he made any permanent impression on the political life of England; and since in 1849 responsible government was firmly established in British colonies of the Dominions class, a governor-general has little or no opportunity of impressing himself on the political life of the dominion in which he is the representative of the Crown. The political annals of the old Northumberland county family of which Earl Grey was the head were of much less importance during Grey's tenure of the earldom than in the days of the second and third earls. Yet when this has been remarked, it must be followed at once by the statement that Mr. Begbie's small volume will be read by thousands of men and women all over the English-speaking world, for ten who will read the biographies of Grey, the premier of 1831-34, and Grey, the colonial secretary of 1846-51, when these now long overdue contributions to the literature of British politics in the nineteenth century make their appearance.

Mr. Begbie's book is not a biography. A biography is to come later—making three Grey biographies that are in prospect. Mr. Begbie has given us a memoir; and a memoir so remarkable in its conception and its character, and so unconventional and stimulating, that it will be read long after there has ceased to be much interest in the story of the vacillating attitude of William IV towards Grey and the reform cabinet of 1832, or any interest in the history of the third Earl Grey's persistent but completely unsuccessful attempt of the middle nineteenth century to persuade the old British North American Provinces that, as free trade was the most advantageous policy for the United Kingdom, it was necessarily also the best policy for the self-governing colonies, and the only fiscal policy that these colonies ought to adopt.

Mr. Begbie's was not a self-imposed task. He did not write this remarkable memoir merely to produce a book. Earl Grey, in the summer of 1917, although he had reached only his sixty-fourth year, realized that his life was rapidly approaching its end. He had undergone an operation that had revealed this sombre fact to him; and he called on Mr. Begbie to aid him in giving his farewell message to the people of England and of the British Empire. Grey was desirous that his fellow-countrymen should know in his own words of the ideals he had cherished, and of his hopes in the closing days of his life for the realization of these political, religious, and social ideals in the new England—the England free from unnecessary poverty and free from slums—that is to be created as an outcome of the suffering and sorrow of the great war.

It is the message that Earl Grey thus sent forth to the world, together with Mr. Begbie's admirable portrayal and interpretation of Grey's personality, and his brief sketch of Grey's work for his ideals, that give abiding value to the memoir, and promise for it a life and a service extending far beyond those of most political or literary biographies. Grey's message as to the importance of a House of Commons that shall not be in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

danger of being overborne by the overwhelming preponderance of one regimented and disciplined political party, but that shall represent as nearly as possible all the people of the United Kingdom, is a message peculiarly for the English people, or rather the people of the British Isles. His message regarding the aims that should underlie the further development of the British Empire has a much wider application. But what Grey had to say of religion and its applicability to daily life, and of the causes which have so long divorced religion from the affairs of daily life—from industry, commerce, and to a large extent from politics—has universal application. There are only twenty-one or twenty-two pages in the chapter on "A People's Church"; but short as it is, the chapter will help to keep the memoir in demand for many a year to come.

The Mysterious Middle West

The Valley of Democracy. By Meredith Nicholson. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. $2.

THE latest observer to attempt to say what he sees when he views the region lying between the Ohio and the Missouri is excellently equipped for the task. Mr. Meredith Nicholson is a native of the Middle West, and yet by virtue of travel and temper is capable of looking at it with a certain detachment, while he is blessed with the Hoosier gift of utterance. If, then, his book leaves the Middle West still somewhat vague, still a good deal of a geographical expression, the explanation must be that, like a rare aroma, it is too intangible to be caught in a net of words and can only be sensed.

The elusiveness of the Middle West is finely illustrated by the way in which it continually escapes Mr. Nicholson's friendly fingers. Again and again one feels oneself upon the verge of witnessing its capture, but it nimbly slips away, and chapter follows chapter with it still hovering ahead. Its pursuer makes his boldest stroke in his opening pages. The Middle Westerners, he says, are Folks; and for the enlightenment of the rest of us he concocts a definition:

"FOLKS. *n.* A superior people, derived largely from the Anglo-Saxon and the Celtic races and domiciled in those northern States of the American Union whose waters fall into the Mississippi. Their *folksiness* (*q. v.*) is expressed in sturdy independence, hostility to capitalistic influence, and a proneness to social and political experiment. They are strong in the fundamental virtues, more or less sincerely averse to conventionality, and believe themselves possessed of a breadth of vision and a devotion to the common good at once beneficent and unique in the annals of mankind."

This is a most promising beginning. Mr. Nicholson, as we should expect, is neither dazzled nor disgusted by his neighbors, and is diverted by them without being deceived into thinking that they are without depth. But he does not get very far beyond this beginning. A winnowing of his pages yields us alertness, cordiality, humor, unconventionality, independence, and lack of culture as the distinguishing features of the Middle West, while the title he gives his volume suggests that all these spell democracy. But he dashes the hopes of the reader who thinks he has penetrated to the heart of the mystery by remarking towards the end of his survey: "After all, there is no spirit of the West that is very different from the spirit of the East." He also forgets, as almost all explorers of the Middle West forget, to say wherein that region differs from the Far West. Perhaps it is part of the elusiveness of the Mississippi Valley that books about it are likely to introduce it to itself rather than to outsiders.

One thing that would assist in the clarification of the mystery would be to distinguish not only the Middle West from the East and the Far West, but the various States of the Middle West from one another. It is not too much to say that certain of these States are more clearly defined in the thought of the average American than the section as a whole. If we only knew the Middle West as we know Kansas—or think we know it! Let Mr. Nicholson make us see how Illinois differs from Indiana, Wisconsin from Michigan, Iowa from Nebraska, and he will not need to say much about the "Middle West." To the rest of the country, New York and Boston typify the East—cold, snobbish, rich, conservative. But proud as the Middle West is of Chicago, there would be a great protest against that interesting city being regarded as typifying the region in which it lies. Only when we see the diversity of that region can we have a general idea of it.

Mr. Nicholson's book suffers here and there from an attack of statistics and items suggestive of year books. The reader feels doubly aggrieved at these lapses because of the genial, sometimes racy, always intimate pictures and observations that they interrupt. His account of politics in the Middle West is particularly good, and what he says about the campaign of 1916 and the attitude of the Middle West towards the war ought to be widely read. If his book is not the last word on the Middle West, any more than the Middle West is the last word on democracy, it is, like the region it depicts, anything but dull.

A Seventeenth Century Master of the Revels

The Dramatic Records of Sir Henry Herbert. Edited by Joseph Quincy Adams, jr. Cornell Studies in English. New Haven: Yale University Press. $2.50.

SIR HENRY HERBERT has been surpassed in fame by his brothers George and Edward, whose lives are recorded in two of the best known of seventeenth century biographies—Izaak Walton's Life of the poet, and the Autobiography of the first Baron Herbert of Cherbury. Sir Henry, however, had no uninteresting career, for he held the office of Master of Revels during fifty years, and his office-book for the years up to 1642 is one of the most important documents in the history of the early stage.

Herbert bought the office from Sir John Astley in 1623, the year in which the first folio of Shakespeare's plays was published with a dedication to the two most distinguished members of the Herbert family, "the most noble and incomparable brethren," the Earls of Pembroke and of Montgomery. The office, as created by Henry VIII, had managed entertainments at the court, but its powers had been gradually enlarged to include the supervision and regulation of public theatrical performances. The young Herbert proved very zealous in maintaining and enlarging his administrative functions and in securing all possible fees. He licensed companies to act in the country, gave special licenses of various sorts to the patented companies, licensed and censored plays for acting and sometimes for printing, and also secured fees from various travelling shows of acrobats and trained animals, and from dispensations permitting performances in Lent or other forbidden seasons. He paid Astley £150 a year, but he made a large fortune from the many perquisites of the office.

The most interesting of his duties was the censorship, and the office-book gives many examples of his punctilious care. Like many other censors, he was more punctilious than efficient. He passed "The Game of Chess," by far the most audacious intrusion of the drama into politics, but he was most painstaking in deleting oaths and substituting more harmless expletives. The dramatist Davenant, whose play had been made ridiculous by this process, took the matter to the King himself. The Master thus recorded his reluctant submission to the royal judgment: "The King is pleased to take faith, death, slight, for asseverations, and no oaths, to which I do humbly submit as to my master's judgment; but, under favour, conceive them to be oaths, and enter them here, to declare my opinion and submission."

On the outbreak of the civil war, Herbert closed the revels office and rode away to fight against the Scots; but he was on

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hand at the Restoration, eager to resume his old duties and emoluments. He even reasserted his dubious claims to license poems and ballads as well as plays for the press, and to supervise all kinds of musical entertainments, including "the rural feasts commonly called Wakes, where there is constantly revelling and music." But he met opposition on all sides, from the patentees of the theatres, from the players, and from provincial authorities. He soon turned the office over to deputies, but they found it troublesome and unlucrative. "I should reckon it the happiest day's work that ever I made in this world," wrote Deputy Hayward, "to be quit of Sir Harry and the office." The Mastership of the Revels had ceased to be of importance in the history of the English drama.

Herbert's office-book was long preserved in a chest in the library at Ribbesford, and was in existence in the last decade of the eighteenth century. It has disappeared, but it was examined by both Malone and Chalmers, who quoted extensively from it in their work on the stage. These quotations were later reprinted by Fleay, but have never been organized or indexed. Professor Adams has performed a much needed service to students by bringing together in one volume all the quotations or citations from the office-book in Malone or Chalmers, and also various miscellaneous documents concerned with Herbert's administration of the revels office. Most of these latter deal with the years 1660 to 1663. It might have been worth while to check the records from Malone and Chalmers with the provincial records collected by Mr. J. T. Murray. In the latter's "English Dramatic Companies" there are many references to Herbert's administration and (II. 360) at least one interesting official letter from him.

Hilda Lessways's Son

The Roll-Call. By Arnold Bennett. New York: George H. Doran Company. $1.50.

THE well-disposed but oft-affronted reader of Arnold Bennett may take up this book with good heart. It is not the work of the "snappy" journalist who duly produces snap-judgments on all conceivable topics, or of the careless spinner of passable yarns for the market, or of the vulgarian who could complacently father a "Pretty Lady" in the hour of the world's torment. It is the Bennett of "The Old Wives' Tale" and "Clayhanger," the subtle chronicler, the musing ironist. A misleading title, for this is not a war-story, or a during-the-war story, so much as a story of England, the England of Five Towns provincialism and London assurance, blundering towards a great hour of decision. And this sense of a continuous approach is given firm basis in the past through the direct relation of the present narrative to the Clayhanger-Lessways tradition. The central figure is none other than Hilda's son George. Clayhanger's attitude towards him in boyhood has been more that of brother than of stepfather. It is through his generosity that young George is able to live in London during his tutelage in architecture. His connection with the firm of Lucas and Enwright comes about through a link with Bursley in the person of John Orgreave, son of Osmond Orgreave, the Five Towns architect and neighbor of the Clayhangers, who had roused in vain the boy Edwin's ambition to be an architect. Young George is to have the chance, and this is the story of what he makes of it and other chances offered by the fragmentary London of which he becomes a part outside the office.

John Orgreave, having carried off triumphantly if not quite reputably that "ripping woman" Mrs. Chris Hamson, has found it discreet to remove to the larger air of London from the somewhat censorious atmosphere of the Five Towns. He is of no great account as junior partner in the firm of Lucas and Enwright, and remains the adoring and slightly fatuous husband of his siren. We come upon young George at the moment when his position as a third in that *ménage* has worn threadbare. He becomes tenant in the house of an elderly handy-man about the office, who turns out to have an attractive daughter; and between the youthful housemates the almost inevitable romantic relation presently springs up. It is noteworthy that although George is a lad of "temperament" (that was recognised, the reader may recall, on his first coming to Bursley as a mere hobbledehoy) none of those broadly sexed incidents, which most of Mr. Bennett's juniors among the younger group of British novelists are wont to deal in, attend the ensuing idyl. It comes to an end because poor Marguerite, a thoroughly good and by no means dull girl, feels constrained to make the old-fashioned choice between love and duty; wifehood and daughterhood; and George Cannon is neither big enough nor small enough to make her choice his own. And already in the offing is another maiden of very different sort, not lacking in physical witchery, calculating, possessive, and pleasure-loving. It is a random word of hers that spurs George Cannon to his absurd undertaking, the winning, "on his own," of an immensely profitable competition. We are able to believe that he succeeds in this, though it is not the easiest thing to believe. But behind it are the distinguished and adored Enwright, who has given George no ordinary grounding, and George's exceptional zeal for work (on occasion), and, finally, the trace of genius in him that knows how to deal with a big task. George wins the job, a monumental town hall for a northern city not far, we may be sure, from the Five Towns. Having won it, he is promptly and permanently annexed by the possessive maiden, who has had her eye on him as a possibility. At twenty-two he has "arrived," and not alone.

So ends Part One, which takes up two-thirds of the book. Part Two shows the George of ten years later, a settled-down George, with two children and another coming, an expensive and ugly and uncomfortable home in a "desirable" neighborhood, and two clubs to which he can escape from the *res angusta* when it pinches too much. Lois is not a bad sort. With all her "cave-woman" instincts, she is devoted to George in her way. He is fond of her still, but fairly adroit in dodging her exactions. The marriage, in short, is not a mockery, nor is it a perfect and satisfying union. Lois has never given him a second inspiration, he has never repeated his precocious feat, never even been "placed" in another competition. He still has a sort of fame as "the youthful prodigy who had won the biggest competition of modern years while almost an infant." It has kept him going, in pocket and in repute, all this time. But it has not kept him going in his own esteem; he is a disappointed and disconcerted man, afraid even of his pecuniary foothold in the near future. Now, however, in the nick of time, comes the winning of an important Indian competition, and on the heels of it an opportunity for immensely profitable work in England. For the war has come, and with it the certain need of huge new plants for the making of munitions; and a great capitalist is ready to give George all he can do in this field. So George Cannon goes up on his high mountain. He is not much over thirty, men of his age are enlisting all about him; but he should be more useful at home. This is important work he is booked for; besides, there is his family, and the new member about to come. But something is working in George,—conscience, or pride, or patriotism: it is the sight of his friend Lucas in a uniform, being worshipped by the women, that does the trick for him! It is followed by a dream of a vast roll-call going on, to which tens of thousands are giving answer. His own name is presently called, and there is only silence and a pause, with men looking at each other with raised eyebrows; but at the name of Lucas one steps forward in his new uniform and salutes and takes his place among the devoted thousands. So George makes his decision: "He did not trouble to marshal the reasons in favor of his joining the army. He had only one reason—he must!" And thus it is that Hilda Lessways's son, with his temperament and his promise, becomes a part of the war-machine. We do not know what it does to him later on. The chronicler wisely puts us off with a glimpse of the new cog adjusting itself, not without a sense of fitness and even of satisfaction, to the prescribed position.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books in Brief

THE ambitious aim of recent students of social psychology has probably been stated best by William Trotter in his recent work on "The Instincts of the Herd in Peace and War." Their programme holds that: "When it is known what types of instinctive mechanism are to be expected, and under what aspects they will appear in the mind, it is possible to press inquiry into many obscurer regions of human behavior and thought, and to arrive at conclusions which, while they are in harmony with the general body of biological science, have the additional value of being immediately useful in the conduct of affairs." This science has been the age-long, if unidentified, pursuit of the practical politician and the demagogue. Propagandists and advertising men have achieved success in proportion to their adaptation of its principles to the exigencies of affairs. Recent "drives" and "public information" campaigns have furnished laboratory studies, directed with all the scientific detachment and cold objectiveness of physical experimentation. But in the upbuilding and maintenance of what is called "morale" the professed students of this science have come into their own. In line with Trotter's proclamation, Ordway Tead has brought out a work on "Instincts in Industry" (Houghton Mifflin; $1.40), with a special purpose in the case of the working class "to show the connection of their conduct with the realities of human nature." The author, after stating his theory and classification of the instincts, takes them up one by one in a series of chapters, showing how interpretation by means of these main-springs of man's action enables us to understand more clearly the various outstanding phenomena in the social life of industrial workers. Control, of course, is the goal toward which such studies tend, but one may doubt whether much has really been accomplished toward realizing it, in spite of the efforts of students. Mr. Tead feels that he is able to establish definite conclusions from his study. He believes that the causes of the conduct of individuals and groups are knowable; that human nature and its elements are subject to law; that conduct, if subject to law, can be controlled if we can control its causes; that the determining conditions of conduct are definitely capable of a measure of manipulation and variation; and "that since adequate expression of individual and group impulses requires a considerable measure of self-direction, it seems not unlikely that the demand for an extension of the democratic method is in fundamental harmony with the facts of human psychology." Although Mr. Tead admits that the solution of the great question to which all this leads is outside his present inquiry, he authoritatively poses it. It is: "Are we, then, to say that industry must square its practices with the facts of our human structure and impulses? Or are we to say that human nature must by some wise discipline be made more amenable to the purposes of our economic life? Or are we rather to say that, knowing the demands which industry must set itself to supply and knowing human nature as it is, we should seek both institutions and purposes for life which will make possible a reconciliation of our needs, our knowledge, and our limitations?"

GEORGE EDWARD WOODBERRY'S "Nathaniel Hawthorne: How to Know Him" (Bobbs-Merrill; $1.25) is the latest volume in a well-established series, and maintains the high average of excellence which the publishers have been careful to secure. It may be doubted, however, if any of the previous writers has been quite so well qualified to treat his assigned author as is Mr. Woodberry; for besides long familiarity with the subject, as evidenced by his biography of Hawthorne which appeared in the "American Men of Letters" series in 1902, there is no one now living who is so peculiarly fitted by racial inheritance to speak of Hawthorne with sympathetic understanding. When William Hawthorne, or Hathorne as it was then spelled, came to Salem in 1637 he was welcomed, doubtless, by John Woodberry, who had helped to found the first church there a few years before, and whose descendants have lived in that part of Massachusetts ever since his time; and in the days of the persecutions there was a Peter Woodberry who had in the wilderness a sort of witch-farm whereto he smuggled at midnight old women about whom words were being whispered, but against whom no charge had yet been made. One wishes Hawthorne could have spent an hour at that witch-farm; but if he had known the story and let his imagination play upon it, what a tale he would have made! To the question of how to know Hawthorne, or any other author, the answer must be three-fold. It is necessary to understand the environment in which he worked, the life and thought of his time and place; to know in what way his reaction to the life about him was peculiar to himself; and to consider him as an artist, studying the qualities of his work and seeing it in relation to universal literature. All these things Mr. Woodberry does well, describing for us, often in Hawthorne's own words, the New England of his time and the Colonial tradition, and discussing in an interesting manner the author's peculiar reaction to what he saw and read; but the most important part of the book is that which deals with Hawthorne as an artist. Mr. Woodberry's conclusions are interesting, even though as he himself states the fame of the author of "The Scarlet Letter" is now going through a period of transition when the local, provincial renown that came to him largely through his subject matter is growing less, while those universal qualities which are without localization in time and place and which alone have power to give a work of art enduring life cannot yet receive final appraisement. Hawthorne, according to Mr. Woodberry, was a moralist who made his art the vehicle of thought upon the profoundest mysteries of human fate; he was more interested in the ideas than in the characters of his stories. But he was also an artist of genius, and it is the genius that gives him his claim to immortality. We have heard a great deal about Hawthorne the New Englander, but we have not heard so much about Hawthorne the artist, and it is this part of Mr. Woodberry's book that makes it a distinguished contribution to the study of American literature.

ARCHIE BELL'S "Sunset Canada: British Columbia and Beyond" (Page; $3.50) is one of a series of books designed to suggest to Americans (in the broad sense) the scenic and other attractions of their own continent. Volumes have already been published on California, Arizona, Florida, Texas, Colorado, Oregon, and the Yellowstone and other parks, and others are in preparation on Louisiana, New Mexico, Georgia, Alaska, Central Canada, the Maritime Provinces, the Great Lakes, etc. They are what might be called glorified guide-books, attractively illustrated and very readable. Mr. Bell, who is no novice at this sort of thing, has produced a book that compares very favorably with its predecessors. To those who have not been fortunate enough to visit Canada's westernmost province, his description of British Columbia's mountain peaks and glaciers, tempestuous rivers and marvellously-colored lakes, vast forests and fertile valleys, will be a revelation. Several chapters are devoted to Vancouver Island. Mr. Bell then takes us over to the mainland, describes the coast towns, salmon fisheries, the Fraser with its memories of the famous gold rush of the fifties, the rise and fall of Yale, and the famous Cariboo trail. He then leads us down through the beautiful lake country, the Okanagan valley rapidly overtaking Southern California as a fruit-producing district, the hunter's paradise of Kootenay, and the great national parks of the Selkirks and Rockies, with their gigantic snow-capped peaks, immense glaciers, alpine meadows, exquisitely-colored lakes, and entrancing waterfalls. The author weaves into his narrative sketches of the romantic history of the province, from the early days of the explorers and fur-traders down to the present time. One chapter is devoted to the story of the Hudson's Bay Company, and another to the settlement of the Doukhobors. What is obviously a popular book can hardly be subjected to the severe tests imposed upon more serious works. Otherwise one might be inclined to criticise some points in Mr. Bell's history of the province. On the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

whole, however, it is admirably designed to meet the needs of those who would know something of this beautiful region of the far Northwest. The book has some fifty illustrations, a few of which are in color; several pages of bibliography; and, what is worth noting, an excellent index. Without wishing to be hypercritical, it is a little difficult to understand why the bibliography of a book on British Columbia and the Rocky Mountains should contain the titles of works relating to sub-arctic Canada, Hudson Bay, the resources of Eastern Canada, and the North West Rebellion. It would have been more to the purpose to include in the list such obvious items as Howard Palmer's "Mountaineering and Exploration in the Selkirks," A. O. Wheeler's "The Selkirk Range," Mary Schaffer's "Old Indian Trails," Milton and Cheadle's "North West Passage by Land," George M. Grant's "Ocean to Ocean," Sandford Fleming's "Old to New Westminster," W. A. Baillie-Grohman's "Camps in the Rockies" and "Fifteen Years' Sport and Life in Western America," Brown and Schaffer's "Alpine Flora of the Canadian Rocky Mountains," George M. Dawson's "The Canadian Rocky Mountains," and O. D. Skelton's "The Railway Builders." One looks in vain through the bibliography for the narratives of the three great explorers of what is now British Columbia, Alexander Mackenzie, Simon Fraser, and David Thompson, all of which are available in printed form.

IN "Thirty-five Years in the Black Belt" (Cornhill Co.; $1.50), William J. Edwards tells us how, after struggling with poverty and ill-health through childhood and adolescence, he lived to establish, within a stone's throw of the cabin in which he was born, the now flourishing Snow Hill Normal and Industrial Institute. This excellent school was started in 1893, soon after the founder's graduation from Tuskegee. On the opening day, we are told, it boasted one teacher, three pupils, and fifty cents in money. The people of the district were woefully poor. "Not more than ten acres of land were owned by colored people, and there was even a mortgage on those ten acres." At the present time, the original rented log cabin has given place to twenty-four buildings standing in 1,940 acres, the entire property (valued at $125,000) being vested in a board of trustees. But, as Mr. Edwards puts it, "the worth of an institution is judged, not by houses and lands, but by its ability to serve the people among whom it is located." How the Institute fares when judged by this standard is shown by Mr. Edwards's statement of the number of its graduates, their advanced status, moral, social, and economic, and the improved condition of life generally in the district within the sphere of the school's influence. That the Negro problem still exists Mr. Edwards readily admits, and he reviews here the various measures which have been proposed for its solution. For himself, he is convinced that the solution is to be sought in compulsory education for all the children of the State, with religious, moral, and industrial training, and with an equitable division of the school fund between the races. "The great factor in the solution of this problem," he says, "is education, and the Negro schools are the hope of the race."

AMERICAN contributions to the science of nutrition, through the work of Atwater, Osborne, Chittenden, and others, have attained a place of world-wide recognition. We are justly proud of them. The title of E. V. McCollum's little book, "The Newer Knowledge of Nutrition" (Macmillan; $1.50), leads us to expect a review of most recent achievements in this field. The work contains, however, in the main only the writer's personal experience gained by laboratory experiments, and the generalizations to which these have led him. Dissatisfied with the purely analytic evaluation of foodstuffs, currently expressed in terms of caloric units, he has endeavored to determine directly and accurately the effect of foodstuffs on the living animal body. By simplifying and purifying the various diets fed to experimental animals he could either add or withdraw definitely-known components and observe the effect on the health and growth of the animals. In the course of these experiments the writer has been able to verify the substance of recent findings, comprised in the so-called vitamine hypothesis of Funk, which postulates that there are contained in wholesome diets certain substances of unknown chemical composition, usually in very small quantities, but of great importance so as to allow their designation as food essentials. By choosing this path of investigation, Mr. McCollum has followed that of modern biology, which holds that, at our present state of knowledge, further light on the mystery of vital phenomena is to be expected from the investigation of function rather than from that of structure. Such a deliberate bias in one direction will always be necessary until a new and more comprehensive conception allows a broader attack with the expectation of a true increase of knowledge. One-sided investigations, such as those presented by the writer, can therefore only transmute former knowledge, can render explicit what was implicit before, and it is well to keep this in mind when we come to the generalization from such experiments as is presented here. It is very doubtful whether the public interest is served by a non-technical presentation of series of experiments which lead to results of a highly hypothetical nature. Necessary as they are in the evolution of scientific thought, experience shows that they are too eagerly snatched up as scientific facts and utilized in propaganda, advertisement, and hasty legislation. The vitamine hypothesis has already been exploited in this direction, and just now we are witnessing a futile and not altogether altruistic discussion about the vitamine content of beer. On the same order of ideas legislation was attempted against the production of polished rice, but was fortunately resisted by an assertion of common sense. For the advocacy of lacto-vegetarianism, for the recommendation of milk, eggs, and leafy vegetables in a truly wholesome diet, the experimental apparatus presented in this book for non-technical readers seems unnecessarily bulky and hardly justifying the claim of originality or novelty.

THE deluge of war literature has brought us none too many of books containing real information on the Eastern countries now about to be reorganized. Such a book is Dr. James L. Barton's "The Christian Approach to Islam" (Pilgrim Press; $2). Besides its thoroughgoing treatment of missionary problems in Moslem lands, it contains much of general interest on Islam, historically and contemporaneously. Dr. Barton shows broad liberality and a conciliatory spirit, although some may consider him still too reluctant to waive theological issues in recommending Christianity to Islam. Valuable is his opinion that the Turkish instinct for atrocity is racial rather than religious. Some novelty attaches to his evidence from Germany concerning the difficulty in which the evangelical mind there was placed by the Mohammedan alliance. Prof. George A. Barton, of Bryn Mawr, late head of the School of Oriental Research in Palestine, wrote portions of the book, revised the manuscript, and read the page proofs. Its occasional mistakes need not therefore be condoned. Referring to the westward transfer of the Greek manuscripts after the fall of Constantinople, it is stated (p. 41): "In due time the study of these books led to that revival of learning which we call the Renaissance." This popular anachronism was exposed by Symonds long ago. It is implied (p. 62) that Turkestan is an "independent Moslem state" in a sense which excludes Persia. Singular forgetfulness of the Crimea rendered possible the following remark (p. 98) about the late war: "This was the first time in history that Turkey had been involved in a great international war as an ally of so-called Christian nations." The Mahdi was not slain at the battle of Omdurman (p. 201), but had died of disease thirteen years before. Mohammedan saint veneration, which is attributed (p. 131) to a yearning for mediation, might with historical interest have been ascribed in part to survivals from the local baalim. Contrariwise, the Moslems' aversion to the doctrine of God's fatherhood, which is sensually understood (p. 268) by them, might have been pointed out as a reaction against the old Semitic belief in physi-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cal divine paternity. In connection with the statement (p. 204) that "Sufism owes its origin to Hindu, Greek, and Persian philosophy," it might have been worth while to investigate also a possible influence by the cult of the Great Anatolian Mother.

THE letters written to Mrs. Drew (Miss Mary Gladstone), and collected in the volume entitled "Some Hawarden Letters: 1878-1913" (Dodd, Mead; $4) are intimate outpourings from a number of eminent and brilliant people, including Ruskin, Burne-Jones, Stead, Balfour, Robert Browning, and others who influenced the thought of Gladstone's day. By no means confined to politics, they illustrate largely the attitude of the writers towards books and pictures, men and women, of the time. Included, among other things, is Lord Acton's interesting, but little known, list of a hundred best books—or to put it more accurately, the books which, in his estimation, have most moved the world. There are, in fact, two lists, one of authors and their works and the other of the subjects with which they decisively dealt. Both lists will often seem to the layman somewhat freakish, and this is especially the case when the two are taken together. Thus, to select only one or two instances: No. 23 in the list of subjects is the rather cryptic: "Twice ruled the world with a thousand years between," and the author who is credited with doing this is Tribonian. Of course, Justinian has hitherto had most of the credit for the Institutes, but now Tribonian comes into his own. No. 35, "Imagination and faith without reasoning faculty," is ascribed to Dante in the "Divine Comedy." "The atomic theory in church and state" is said to be the discovery of Robinson. From a purely literary point of view, very curious is Lord Acton's appraisal of George Eliot, in regard to which the editors appropriately say that it is in some sense a challenge to the twentieth century: "You cannot think how much I owed her. Of eighteen or twenty writers by whom I am conscious that my mind has been formed, she was one. . . . In problems of life and thought which baffled Shakespeare, her touch was unfailing. No writer ever lived who had anything like her power of manifold but disinterested and impartial sympathy. If Sophocles or Cervantes had lived in the light of our culture, if Dante had prospered like Manzoni, George Eliot might have had a rival . . . it was 'Middlemarch' that revealed to me not only her grand serenity, but her superiority to some of the greatest writers."

NOT a few are still alive whose memories of travel go back to the days when railway trains were brought to a standstill, with much bumping and thumping, by hand-brakes applied while the intended stopping-place was still half a mile or more distant. The delightful transition from this bone-racking and time-wasting method to the promptly efficient air-brake became long ago vaguely associated with the name of Westinghouse, a name that later identified itself with numerous other mechanical inventions and improvements. This vagueness of knowledge now gives place to definite information as we turn the pages of Francis E. Leupp's "George Westinghouse: His Life and Achievements" (Little, Brown; $3). Clearness and fixedness of purpose, quickness of perception, and a marvellous inventiveness, all backed by unusual will-power, marked the boy Westinghouse, as they distinguished the grown man; and though he died in what is now regarded as little beyond the prime of life, his record of achievement is fairly astounding, as set forth in his biography. On the human side this man of machines and factories reveals traits that interest and attract. Of his biographer's qualifications for such a work as is now, five years after the inventor's death, brought to a close, no question will be raised by any reader of those earlier essays of similar character from the same pen. One may not go all the way with the chronicler in pronouncing his present hero "probably the most remarkable industrial leader and prophet this country has ever produced," but there will be no fault found with the tone of enthusiastic admiration that gives vitality to the book.

Literary Notes

"American Labor and the War" by Samuel Gompers appears among the February announcements of Messrs. Doran.

Theodore Dreiser has written a book of biographical and autobiographical quality, entitled "Twelve Men," which Boni & Liveright will publish in March.

A new book by Mildred Aldrich, author of "A Hilltop on the Marne" and "The Peak of the Load," is announced by Small, Maynard & Co. It will be entitled "When Johnny Comes Marching Home."

A fresh contribution to the discussion of the millennium will be made by Dr. James H. Snowden in his book, "The Coming of the Lord: Will It Be Premillennial?" which the Macmillan Co. has nearly ready for publication.

The nebulous details of Lincoln's early love affair have been utilized for a novel, "The Soul of Ann Rutledge: Abraham Lincoln's Romance," by Bernie Babcock, which the Lippincotts have in press for early publication.

Following the example recently set by his brother poet, Alfred Noyes, Sir Henry Newbolt has written a volume of tales of the submarine campaign, soon to be published by Messrs. Longmans under the title, "Submarine and Anti-Submarine."

Captain H. G. Gilliland's account of "My German Prisons," when published in England, was inhibited by the censorship; but now that the war restrictions are lifted, it will soon appear in an enlarged American edition, with the Houghton Mifflin Co.'s imprint.

Brand Whitlock's long awaited account of his experiences in Belgium during the German occupation is promised for early spring publication by Messrs. Appleton. The work, only a part of which has appeared serially, will be issued in two large volumes.

The discovery of England and France by the untravelled doughboy of America, and his characteristic experiences in those lands, are described by Major Ian Hay Beith in his new book, "The Last Million," which Houghton Mifflin Co. will publish immediately.

Dr. Maurice Francis Egan, for the past ten years United States Minister to Denmark, has written an account of his experiences in "the listening gallery of Europe," as the Copenhagen court is sometimes called. Messrs. Doran will publish the book soon under the title, "Ten Years Near the German Frontier."

A biography of the late Joseph Hodges Choate has been undertaken, at the request of Mrs. Choate, by Edward S. Martin. Those who have letters from Mr. Choate which they are willing to lend for use in the proposed work are invited to forward them to Mr. Martin, in care of Charles Scribner's Sons, 597 Fifth Avenue, New York.

Those who recall the remarkable book of "Modern War Paintings" by C. R. W. Nevinson, published a year or more ago, will be glad to know that another collection of reproductions from this artist's war pictures is to be brought out shortly by Robert McBride & Co. Mr. Nevinson is a son of the noted English war correspondent, H. W. Nevinson.

The American publishing output of 1918, according to statistics gathered by the *Publishers' Weekly*, consisted of 6,861 books and 2,376 pamphlets. In comparison with the 1917 figures, this represents a decrease of 823 titles. The heaviest falling-off is shown in the departments of sociology, fiction, general literature, and religion; while the most conspicuous increase is found in the field of history.

In brave despite of Meredith's warning that he would "most horribly haunt" any one who should publish a biography of him after his death, S. M. Ellis has recently completed a work entitled "George Meredith: His Life and Friends," which Grant Richards of London will issue at once. Because of his personal relations with Meredith, and his own literary qualifications, Mr. Ellis seems well fitted for the task which he has undertaken; and his book is likely to be the nearest approach to an authoritative biography of the great Victorian that we shall have for some time.

A translation by Mary J. Serrano of "Amalia," by the Argentine author, José Marmol, will appear at once with the Dutton imprint. Although this novel has been read for forty years in their own tongues by Russians, Poles, Germans, French, and all Spanish-speaking peoples of both hemispheres, it has never before appeared in adequate form in English. Some parts of it have been used, selected and condensed, in school reading-books; but notwithstanding its more than a generation of almost world-wide fame, English-speaking people have known almost nothing about it.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Art

The Allied Artists

THE Allied Artists of America have dispensed with a Jury of Selection. Each artist makes his "own choice" of his own work, contributing presumably what he thinks will best represent him. The experiment has been tried by the independent groups in both France and England, but in neither country has the result been an exhibition of such surpassing interest as to encourage its imitation. Much rubbish has to be waded through in the Paris or the London show before the rare exception is discovered. In New York the rubbish is less, but then so also are the exceptions in proportion fewer. After all, in most of our exhibitions the jury is composed of artists who can judge the work submitted to them from a technical standpoint. It is well that every artist should have his chance but he does not have it in a gallery where everything sent in must find a place. To make an exhibition interesting, some attention must be paid to its quality as a whole.

At a first glance, the Allied Artists seem to have made their sixth annual show more interesting than the typical exhibition held in the same Fine Arts Building. Each picture has space, elbow room, which always lends an air of distinction. But to look more carefully is to be disappointed. What is found is a high average of technical skill, but absence of original experiment or invention, characteristic of most exhibitions of contemporary American art. There are many pleasant landscapes, but of few can more be said. The snow, of which this winter has been so sparing, appears on every side but nowhere as if it had presented an absorbing or inspiring problem to the painters. Paintings of snow have a dangerous tendency to degenerate into oversized Christmas cards. However, there is careful study of the pale winter yellow light in Hobart Nichols's "Brook," and of dull grey light on a wide white-shrouded countryside in Ray Brown's "Winter," while both William H. Singer, jr., and Ernest Albert appreciate the value of a river or stream in breaking the monotomy of their snow spaces with suggestive lines, a value of which Redfield and Schofield have since learned the secret. But these things have been done many times, and no American has yet treated snow with the vigor of Fritz Thaulow. Robert Vonnoh in his impressions of autumn foliage, all rusty browns and purplish reds relieved by a touch of vivid green from a lonely cedar or paling in the moonrise, does make the effort to see things for himself which is unusual with the landscape painter nowadays. Less often still does any such effort seem to disturb the serenity of the painter of cattle. The modern painter may have got far from Paul Potter's bull, but that does not necessarily mean originality, for since Paul Potter there have been many cattle painters to supply new conventions. If Edward C. Volkert has nothing to say that has not been said before in his grouping and arrangement of cattle at pasture, at least he groups and arranges them in agreeable sunlit country and gets the effect he seeks, more especially in his small sketches.

Effort, if not to see, at any rate to imagine, an effect may be in Eliot Clark's "Sea Tragedy," one of the few reminders of the war in the exhibition. His ship, as it goes down in a chaos of smoke and flame, appears to be at pains to consider the composition with which it meets its fate, even the lifeboats balancing each other neatly in the design, so that the tragedy cannot carry us very far from the studio. For the painter's invention, one would turn rather to a much less pretentious canvas like the small study of the interior of the Pennsylvania Station by Lester D. Boronda, who seems to have noted and been amused by the color and the atmosphere in that uselessly spacious building. But amusement in subject or motive is apparently about the last thing most of the exhibitors have expected or found. Certainly, the portrait painters give no sign of exacting it from their sitters. How little character there is in any of the sitters! How little life! How little attempt at individuality in pose or charm in color! Mere lay figures, lifeless puppets—the dress as dreary as the manikin within it.

The Center Gallery is given over to sketches, the painters' notes and memoranda. At times these have a freshness, a suggestiveness, lost in his finished work. Volkert is better in his sketches than his large paintings of cattle, and so also there is more life in the cattle studies by Glenn Newell, in the Remington-like drawings of W. R. Leigh, the notes of color and architecture by Boronda. But this gallery is crowded if the other two are not. A Jury of Selection would probably have rejected half the sketches shown and the collection would have looked all the better for it.

N. N.

Drama

Nat Goodwin

"I COULD have better spared a better man," said Prince Hal on Shrewsbury field, in soliloquizing over the recumbent body of the feigning Falstaff. Many an old playgoer, doubtless, was moved by a similar sentiment upon hearing of the sudden passing of the late Nat Goodwin. There was nobody on the modern stage just like him. It might be said of him, as of Yorick, that he often set the tables in a roar. Few actors were more skilled than he in provoking gales of cheerful and hearty laughter—no despicable gift in a somewhat drab world. He was, by nature, a very funny man, a rare buffoon, but also he was much more than this, possessing in his quick and lively intelligence, his vein of caustic and humorous satire, his mastery of facial play, and his instinct for comic situation, many of the distinguishing attributes of the true comedian. And in his infinitely varied stage experience, which began in the fruitful school of the older burlesque, he acquired the facility, authority, and adaptability of the thoroughly well trained actor. Moreover, he was the subject of a fitful ambition which, from time to time, throughout his prolonged career, prompted him to efforts in the more serious and even the classic drama, but these failed, chiefly because he was a creature of wayward impulse, reckless, adventurous, and self-indulgent, without stability of character or purpose. Had it been otherwise he probably would have become one of the outstanding theatrical figures of his era.

just released!

MEN IN WAR, by Andreas Latzko.

Acclaimed by the leading critics of the country as *The Outstanding Masterpiece of the War.*—Seven editions sold from April to June, 1918, when it was denied the mailing privileges. Now in *eighth* American, *third* English edition.

$1.50—postage 10c. extra

BE SURE TO READ

THE PRESTONS, by Mary Heaton Vorse.

"The best and most entertaining story of an American family of modern American fiction."—Review of Reviews.

$1.75—postage 10c. extra

BONI & LIVERIGHT, 109 W. 40th St., N.Y.

Publishers of Good Books

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Brilliantly successful as he often was, his record is a melancholy example of wasted opportunities. Here there need be no pretence of reviewing his life in detail, its arduous beginnings, sudden access of prosperity, frequent flashes of unrealized triumph, lapses into temporary oblivion, disastrous matrimonial experiments, fortunate speculations, legal troubles, and all the incidents which helped to make him notorious when he might have been famous. But the sum of his dramatic achievement is sufficient to make a brief summary pertinent. If the nature of his work was seldom important, he at least often conferred a temporary distinction upon it by the superiority of his execution. Old playgoers have not yet forgotten the comic force and extraordinary (in the proper sense) cleverness of his Le Blanc, one of his earliest successes. This was a bit of genuine burlesque, with a refinement of satiric humor underlying its broadest extravagance. It had brains as well as grotesqueness and agility. In his youth he was an admirable eccentric dancer. In all the best of his subsequent farcical work there was always the suggestion of the same keen intelligence that constituted the charm of his later performances of light or more serious comedy. He was an adept in the illustration of all the phases of inebriation, and, like Jefferson, had the dangerous knack of making them inoffensive. In certain types of farce, indeed, as in "Lend Me Five Shillings," he might challenge comparison with that exquisite comedian.

As he grew older he gradually established a sound reputation in plays of stronger texture, in serious comedy and melodrama, in "A Gold Mine," "A Gilded Fool," and "In Mizzoura," playing successfully in England as well as all over this country. He exhibited control of pose, passion, and of simple pathos, but his strength still lay chiefly in the more comic interludes. In the artificial but theatrically effective "David Garrick" he was, for the most part, completely at sea. But he found parts nicely suited to him in "An American Citizen" and "The Cowboy and the Lady," and in them enjoyed a period of long prosperity. Later he was seen, perhaps at his best, in "When We Were Twenty-one." In all these pieces he acted brilliantly, but in characters that did not impose any very severe test of the highest ability. This he found in "Shylock" and failed, somewhat dismally, to meet it, although he displayed much futile cleverness. In "Lucius O'Trigger" he was much more at home, although, as was to be expected, his performance was destitute of style. As Bottom, he was funny, as funny as James Lewis, but of the real Shakespearean humor revealed scarcely a glimmer. After this, though he played much, he did nothing of special note except his James Barley, in "The Captain of the Barge," and that was an achievement of no significance. Perhaps the fairest estimate that can be made of him is that he was a first rate actor of second rate parts, to which his individual humor, which was peculiar and vivid, imparted a momentary vitality which was not inherent in them. J. R. T.

Every Book
advertised in this magazine (with possibly a few exceptions) is to be had on its day of publication at
Brentano's
Book Store
PROMPT ATTENTION GIVEN ALL MAIL ORDERS
Broadway at Ninth Street
NEW YORK AND IN PHILADELPHIA

Finance

As to Business Reaction

MANY conflicting views are being expressed concerning the future of business in the United States. Always an interesting subject, this topic has been very generally discussed since Charles M. Schwab was quoted in dispatches from Germany the other day as saying that there would not be many reconstruction orders for American manufacturers from abroad and that a period of depression would be experienced in the United States before our own business began to show much expansion.

On this announcement there was a quick decline in the stock market, although the selling was neither violent nor spectacular. Mr. Schwab has a large following and it was natural that such remarks from him would have a good deal of influence upon sentiment. A few days ago the United States Steel Corporation again cut its extra dividend and the showing of earnings reported for the December quarter furnished abundant proof concerning the necessity for this action. There have been other indications that this view of Mr. Schwab's reflected the expectation of excellent judges of the steel trade. Some mills are now operating on a 60 per cent. basis and the industry as a whole shows heavily decreased activity.

Since the signing of the armistice on November 11 last a good deal has happened to indicate that American manufacturers would not receive the large volume of orders which were expected to develop in connection with the reconstruction of Europe's crippled industries. Those competent to speak about conditions in France said that a large amount of the new building which would have to be provided in the war-wrecked area was of simple wood and frame construction and would not require American steel. It was pointed out that such extensive building operations as would have to be arranged for would be provided by local industry and that it would not be necessary for American steel manufacturers to make large shipments of their own products for this purpose.

Much has been done towards readjusting American industry to a peace basis. An immense volume of war work has been stopped completely. Practically all of the important war boards have gone out of business and open market conditions prevail for the basic materials. Various raw and finished products are quoted at prices much below those which prevailed at the time that hostilities ceased. Furthermore, there has been some improvement in the efficiency of labor with a sufficient surplus of workers to bring about a decided change in the labor markets. At various important cities, a sufficient surplus of workers is reported to be seeking employment to make it probable that wages before long may be somewhat reduced. Whether they are or not there are various signs pointing to a decided reduction in certain food costs. Inasmuch as the labor leaders have said that no readjustment of wages need be expected so long as exorbitantly high living costs prevail, the time may be near at hand when this situation will rectify itself and when a large proportion of those idle will be less exacting in their demands.

In any thoroughgoing consideration of the business outlook, all these conditions must be reckoned with, since it is of vital importance for the readjustment to take place with as little disturbance as possible. It may be true, as Judge Gary says, that there may be plenty of work for those who really desire it. It is conceivable that, if the other states follow the example of Massachusetts and launch vast schemes of improvement work

Amusements

"Everything" "Is the biggest thing ever."—*Journal*, and at the lowest prices. AT THE
Mat. To-day Best Seats $1 Evenings at 8:15 HIPPODROME

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

so as to provide employment for idle workers, the labor surplus whatever it is will be utilized. But the fact remains that the action of the United States Steel Corporation in further reducing its extra dividend and the action of the Bethlehem Steel Corporation in pursuing a somewhat similar policy all point strongly towards a definite hold-up in business activity. This may be short lived, or it may continue for several months.

WILLIAM JUSTUS BOIES

BOOKS OF THE WEEK

EDUCATION

Baker, A. T., editor. Selected Letters of Madame de Sévigné. Longmans, Green. $1.10.

Roe, Frederick W. Selections and Essays by John Ruskin. Modern Student's Library. Scribners. 75 cents.

Veblen, Thorstein. The Higher Learning in America. Huebsch. $2.

FICTION

Anonymous. Patricia Brent, Spinster. Doran. $1.50.

Bernard, Marguerite, and Serrell, Edith. Deer Godchild. Scribners. $1.

Bradley, Mary H. The Wine of Astonishment. Appleton. $1.50.

Doyle, A. Conan. Danger! and Other Stories. Doran. $1.50.

Merrick, Leonard. While Paris Laughed. Dutton. $1.75.

PUBLIC AFFAIRS

Brown, John F. New Era Economics. Indianapolis: The Author. $1.

Howe, Frederic C. The Only Possible Peace. Scribners. $1.50.

McMurtrie, Douglas C. The Disabled Soldier. Macmillan. $2.

Slingerland, W. H. Child-Placing in Families. New York: Russell Sage Foundation. $2.

Story, R. McC. The American Municipal Executive. University of Illinois. $1.25.

Willoughby, Westel W. Prussian Political Philosophy: Its Principles and Implications. Appleton. $1.50.

MISCELLANEOUS

Ayer's American Newspaper Annual and Directory. Philadelphia: N. W. Ayer & Son. $10.

Galsworthy, John. Another Sheaf. Scribners. $1.50.

Harris, F. S. The Sugar-Beet in America. Rural Science Series. Macmillan. $2.25.

Henderson, Louise. Practical Home Nursing. Macmillan. $1.50.

Howe, M. A. De Wolfe. The Massachusetts Humane Society, 1785-1916. Boston: Published by the Society.

MacKaye, Percy. Washington: The Man Who Made Us. Knopf. $1.75.

Wright-Davis, Mary. The Book of Lincoln. Doran. $2.50.

The People's Part in Peace

By ORDWAY TEAD

$1.10 net

A book to help in the understanding of the Peace Conference. It brings together the various labor declarations in regard to peace terms and discusses the League of Nations from an economic standpoint.

Henry Holt & Co. 19 W. 44th St. New York

BINDER FOR THE NATION

To receive the current number in a convenient (temporary) form. Substantially made, bound in cloth, with THE NATION stamped on the side in gold. Holds about one volume. Papers easily and neatly adjusted. Sent, postpaid, on receipt of 75 cents. Address The Nation, 20 Vesey Street, New York City.

THE MESSENGER

Only Radical Negro Magazine in America

Edited by Chandler Owen and A. Philip Randolph

——JUST OFF THE PRESS——

Presents a Reconstruction Supplement which is a scientific program for the Negro problem in America.

COMMENTS

"You both write clearly, forcefully, in diction that is fine, and with ample knowledge and grasp of your themes. One may dispute your opinions, but not criticize with much success your presentation."

Thomas W. Churchill, former President of the New York City Board of Education.

"As a former Professor of English, permit me to congratulate you both on the skill and vivacity with which you both write. But far more important to me than the style of your writing is the substance,—the courage and the significance of what you have to say."

H. W. L. Dana, Professor of English and Comparative Literature for ten years in Columbia University, N. Y. C.

"I have just read the current copy of your magazine. It has a lot of good stuff in it."

Roger N. Baldwin.

15 *cents a copy* - - - $1.50 *a year*

The Messenger Publishing Co.

2305 SEVENTH AVENUE NEW YORK CITY

REPRESENTATIVE BRITISH DRAMAS:

Victorian and Modern

Edited by

MONTROSE J. MOSES

A Series of Dramas which illustrate the progress of the British Dramatist, and emphasize the important features of the History of the British Theatre.

This volume contains the complete text of 21 plays. Mr. Moses has been fortunate in securing the most notable English Dramas, from Sheridan Knowles down to John Masefield; and the most representative Irish Dramas from William Butler Yates down to Lord Dunsany.

873 pages. $4.00 net.

LITTLE, BROWN & CO., Publishers, Boston

PSYCHO-ANALYSIS AND YOUR LIFE

a course of ten lectures by

ANDRE TRIDON

Wed. eve. at 8, Park View Palace, 5 W. 110th St.

Course ticket: $2, from Martin Roob, 115 Bdway.

FORMATIVE TYPES IN ENGLISH POETRY

By George Herbert Palmer

Essays on Chaucer, Spenser, George Herbert, Pope, Wordsworth, Tennyson, and Browning. $1.50 *net.*

HOUGHTON MIFFLIN COMPANY, Boston

THE GAME BIRDS OF CALIFORNIA

By J. Grinnell, H. C. Bryant, and T. I. Storer

642 pages 16 colored plates 94 line drawings

Price, cloth, $6.00 (carriage extra)

A comprehensive book on the game birds of California such as sportsmen, nature lovers, and serious students of birds have long needed, containing detailed descriptions of the 108 native game birds of the state.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS

280 Madison Ave., New York Berkeley, Cal.

A League of Nations

By L. OPPENHEIM, M. A., LL.D. 8vo.

This volume will consist of three lectures recently delivered before the University of Cambridge. The author holds that, after the map of Europe has been redrawn at the approaching Peace Congress, the Third Conference should assemble at The Hague for the purpose of establishing the proposed international league and supplying it with the rudiments of an organization. $2.00 net.

LONGMANS, GREEN & CO., Publishers

FOURTH AVE. & 30TH ST., NEW YORK.

To understand WORLD POLITICS *read:*

The Aims of Labour *by* Arthur Henderson, M. P. ($1.00).

Ireland: A Study in Nationalism *by* Francis Hackett. ($2.00).

Jean Jaurès *by* Margaret Pease. ($1.00).

How Diplomats Make War *by* Francis Neilson. ($1.50).

Young India *by* Lajpat Rai. ($1.50).

B. W. HUEBSCH *Publisher* NEW YORK

HOW FREE MEN THINK

A course of lecture-discussions on Humanism, by

Everett Dean Martin

Every Saturday evening at 8:15

Lecture Hall of the Stuyvesant Neighborhood House

9th and Stuyvesant Streets, near Astor Place

THE BIOLOGY OF WAR

By Dr. G. F. Nicolai

A vital conception of war supplying solid ground for sane men and women to stand on. 8vo, 394 *pages*, $3.50.

Published by

THE CENTURY CO. NEW YORK

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

RUSSIA

The Nation has published during the past few months the following articles and documents dealing with Russia and the Soviets:

Documents:

Russian Soviet Decrees
The Constitution of Russia
The Law of Socialization of the Land
A Bolshevist Outburst
Russian News Bulletins

Articles:

Is It True?
Hands Off in Europe
The Sisson Documents
The Red Fleet in the Baltic
Maxim Gorky and the Revolution
Who Shall Inherit the Power in Russia?
Nadson, a Minor Poet of Czarist Russia
Chekhov's Peasants
Russia as Seen by Americans
A Russian Painter and New York Water Colorists
The Russian Red Cross
The Siberian Duma
Allied Espionage in Russia
The Rumor in Russia
Getting Together on Russia
More 'Truth" About Russia
Justice to Russia
"The Need of Russia—A Dictator"
The Resurrection of Vodka
Bolshevism True and False
The Affair of the Rubles
Russia in a New Role

In Pamphlet Form

Russian Reprints—(containing articles and documents from the issues of November 16th, 23d, and 30th) ..... 10 cents a copy
The Russian Constitution ..... 5 " " "
The Russian Land Decree ..... 5 " " "

These pamphlets may be had at special rates in quantities

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

International Relations Section

Vol. CVIII NEW YORK, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1919 No. 2797

Two Problems of Jugoslavia

By VLADISLAV R. SAVICH

AUSTRIA-HUNGARY has ceased to exist. The Jugoslavs are free. At last they have an opportunity which for centuries was denied to them of expressing themselves freely on all matters concerning their future national life. Many prejudices and preconceived ideas will be tested in the broad light of liberty. We must expect in the first days of their independence some confusion and apparent anarchy. With foreign pressure removed, different interests, ideas, tendencies, and sentiments will for a time struggle together, each claiming recognition or possible predominance.

Two main questions are likely to absorb at the outset the attention of Jugoslavia, namely, the problem of the national union of all the Jugoslavs, Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes, and the form of the future government. The first problem is the more important, since the form of government will depend very much on the way in which the problem of national unity is solved. Both questions must be answered before further steps can be taken.

In regard to national unity, two views are widely held. One, apparently shared by a majority in each case of the Serbs, the Croats, and the Slovenes, may be stated thus: The Jugoslavs are three separate nations, with three national feelings, three distinct psychologies, three different forms of consciousness. Nevertheless, they are very near one another. The Serbs and the Croats speak the same language but differ in religion and historical traditions. The Croats and Slovenes have the same Roman Catholic religion but differ slightly in language and historic past. This view recognizes that politically, economically, or as a race they still have very much in common. Consequently, they ought to unite for the defence of their national independence, at the same time that each group should guard jealously its own individuality and continue to develop in its own peculiar way according to its tradition and its psychology. According to this, union would be imposed upon the Jugoslavs by inimical foreign forces threatening their independence, but would not correspond to any inner cravings of the soul. Hence, in the future Jugoslavia, we are invited to recognize three distinct groups whose unity would be of a more or less mechanical character. Such a union, lacking a stronger spiritual cohesion, would dissolve under the first pressure from without or go to pieces under the first shock of inner centrifugal forces. It is scarcely probable that the Jugoslavs would find either peace, freedom, or prosperity in a Jugoslavia built on such a moral basis. Their Slav temperament and lack of political experience would very soon prove an unsurmountable obstacle to the continuance of unity. Moreover, the projected league of nations or any other similar arrangement, by guaranteeing their freedom, will make any pressure from outside insignificant, and hence all the centrifugal forces within would have free play. The life of the Jugoslavs would be characterized by a nervous vigilance against one another which would hamper all progress of a broad sort; their energy would be exhausted in petty jealousies, passing from one crisis to another until, some fine day, they would part to the accompaniment of noise and more or less scandal and tribulation. The dissolution of the one-time union between Belgium and Holland, or between Sweden and Norway, are good illustrations of what such a Jugoslavia might expect.

The present difficulties of the Jugoslav situation have their main source in the conception of union just stated. Of the three Jugoslav groups the Serbs are the most numerous. They number about eight millions, of whom five millions are in Serbia and Montenegro and three millions in Austria-Hungary. The Croats number about three millions, and the Slovenes only a million and a quarter. Further, the Serbs are better known and enjoy a greater credit at the moment on account of their struggles and sacrifices for the common cause in the late war. It is natural, therefore, to expect some misgiving on the part of the other two branches of the Jugoslavs lest the Serbs should absorb them and impose upon them their own government and national spirit. This misgiving, partly sincere and justifiable, is very much strengthened by the Austrian, Magyar, or Roman Catholic agencies which through generations have striven to keep the Jugoslavs divided. The influence of those agencies still exists and cannot very soon be completely eradicated. On the other hand the Serbs, who have always been regarded by those agencies as rebellious and schismatic, are prone to attribute nearly everything that is disagreeable to them to the direct activity of those hated agencies. Therein exists a further source of misunderstanding between the Serbs and the Croats. During the war those agencies have been at work trying to wreck the union of the Jugoslavs. Thus the Archbishop of Bosnia, Stadler, presented a memorandum to the Emperor Charles urging the creation of a modest Jugoslavia, to comprise Croatia, Dalmatia, and Bosnia, leaving the Slovenes to the Germans and the Serbs in South Hungary to the Magyars, while organizing a smaller part of pre-war Serbia and Montenegro as a quasi-independent state.

Many Jugoslavs who stand sincerely for union would like to take all necessary precautions, and provide guarantees against any infringement of the rights of any of the three groups. For this reason some are not satisfied with the Declaration of Corfu; some want a republic, others are Bolsheviki, etc. What the numerical strength of these different tendencies is, is very difficult to gauge. All these opinions, strivings, and passions, however, will find expression in the Jugoslav discussions already freely begun, not only in Europe but wherever the Jugoslavs are to be found. As many insist that the Serbs, the Croats, and the Slovenes should jealously guard their present individualities as peoples, the difficulty of finding a solution of pressing problems increases rather than lessens.

EDUCATION LIBRARY

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But there is another view which is shared by many Jugoslavs of the younger generation and which is also the view of the present writer. It is that the Serbs, the Croats, and the Slovenes are only three component parts of a single nation. The three names as well as the existing differences are an outcome of the unfavorable conditions under which, until now, they have labored. Those conditions kept the Jugoslavs divided by force, and hampered the perfect fusion of the three elements in one whole, notwithstanding the natural tendencies of their character. In order to realize their true nature they must amalgamate in an organic union. Their future must be a reaction against the foreign forces of division. In freedom they must work out that complete unity which is the true expression of their moral as well as of their political and economic interests. Only in unity can they achieve the noblest aspirations of their soul, and without it the happiness which is the goal of every social organization is impossible for them. In looking upon unity from this point of view, that of a nation single in spirit, purpose, and character, many of the present difficulties will disappear of themselves and all the others may be discussed in a quiet atmosphere of confidence and be, consequently, easier of solution.

At the present time it would seem that the real purpose of union is sufficiently clear to all of the Jugoslavs. The aim is not merely a free Serbia, nor a free Croatia or Slovenia, nor even a free Jugoslavia; the aim must be the happiness of the Jugoslav people. That can be achieved only in freedom and can be expressed through their institutions, arts, and other spiritual achievements which together make up their culture. If they were to aim at realizing a particular Serbian, Croatian, or Slovene culture their mechanical union would be an obstacle to its attainment. If, on the other hand, their happiness depends upon their unity, they should cease quarrelling over petty differences and cooperate for the realization of a single, common civilization. They should start with the conviction that their happiness is in the future. For this reason they must break with everything in their past that is an obstacle to their happiness. As their particular names are one such obstacle, they should abandon them and adopt a new one to which all shall agree; only by so doing can they disarm all suspicions and kill in the germ all future frictions arising from the desire of one group to predominate over another. When the very names of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes shall be lost under a common designation, there will be no one to be suspected nor any to be fought against. The former Italian states of Genoa, Florence, and Venice have had a longer history and have done more for European civilization than Serbia, Croatia, and Slovenia. The states of Italy have found it possible and advisable to unite under a common name, and the Jugoslavs ought to be able to do the same if national unity is their objective.

If this latter conception of the unity of the Jugoslavs should prevail, the problem of the form of government can be solved more easily. In July, 1917, the Serbian Government, represented at that time by the leaders of all political parties in Serbia and the Jugoslav Committee at London, and presided over by Mr. Anto Trumbich, the leader of the Croatian National party of Dalmatia, drew up a document known as the Declaration of Corfu, in form a brief sketch of the main features of the future Constitution of the Jugoslav state. The Declaration of Corfu is not a final act. It has not, and could not have, the value of a law. It was a hasty bridge between a miserable past and a brighter future. It is obligatory only for the parties who signed it. The Declaration provides that the future form of the government shall be a monarchy, with the Karageorgevich dynasty at its head. But it also provides that a constitutional assembly of representatives elected by universal, secret, equal, and direct suffrage of the whole population shall draw up a new Constitution and settle all questions of form and principles. As this constituent assembly will be a sovereign body, it will of course have to decide whether the government shall be a monarchy or a republic.

What is the present outlook for one or the other form of government in the future Jugoslavia? In the past, the prospect for a republic was not bright. The majority of the Jugoslavs, who lived in Austria-Hungary, were denied the elementary rights of citizenship, and in consequence could not even think of such a form of government as a republic. The Serbs in Serbia and Montenegro were free, but their views regarding either monarchy or republic were governed by the general situation in Europe and the conditions among the Jugoslavs, and they preferred the form which offered the best guarantee of freedom and unity for the whole race. Moreover, the belief was general among them that Russia would play the leading part in the realization of their ideal. It was necessary to spare the susceptibilities and cultivate the benevolence of the Russian Government, and as Russia was an autocracy, the republican idea was not in favor among the Jugoslavs lest it should eliminate Russian help. For all these reasons, no republican movement was perceptible among them before the war.

During the war, however, great changes have taken place which cannot but influence the attitude of the Jugoslavs. Russia, the bulwark of autocracy, has become a republic and is not likely to return to a monarchy. The war was fought to make the world safe for democracy, and a republic is a higher expression of democracy than is a monarchy. Having come into contact with the great nations of the world, the Jugoslavs are now influenced by the general current of thought which so clearly favors the republican form of government. In addition, the Jugoslavs have fought during the war as the allies of two great republics, France and the United States, and they should strive to approach, in their political institutions, the nations which they believe to be most progressive. Just as heretofore they cultivated the benevolence of Russia, so now they must look forward to strengthening and making permanent the friendship of America. It is no wonder that a republican movement has already started among the Jugoslavs, and that it may gain impetus before the constituent assembly shall be convoked.

What, on the other hand, are the chances for a Jugoslav monarchy? The political institutions of a nation are very fine textures which, in order to fulfil their function, must satisfy many special requirements and be adapted to the character of the people whose destiny they will affect. It is by no means the case that a higher form of government will be better for every people in every hour of their history. On the contrary, a form of government which is known to the people might secure to them a greater measure of freedom, progress, and happiness than a form which, although theoretically better, was unfamiliar. Serbia, for example, is a monarchy, and since Serbia has played a decisive part in the realization of Jugoslav liberty, the disposition of its

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

people must be taken into serious account in any future plans for Jugoslavia. To overthrow the Serbian monarchy would mean a new struggle. But the Serbian people are well-nigh exhausted by the present war, and they can in justice demand that they be spared any new effort unless the advantages to be secured are positive and great.

It would be easier to proclaim a republic than to agree upon its form. Shall it, for example, be bourgeois, or socialistic, or communistic? Such a controversy might lead to anarchy, and would certainly weigh in the decision of the constituent assembly. Again, the Jugoslav aspiration for unity can easily be compromised by lack of political experience and the difficulty of finding a suitable leader or a strong party to carry on the work of the government during the first few years of united freedom. In the future Jugoslav assembly some twenty political parties will be represented which have never before coöperated. The members of the parties and their recognized leaders are very little acquainted with one another, and the formation of a strong working majority will be a hard task. There would be a permanent danger of secession if some stable authority were not to be erected above a party struggle which inevitably will be violent in a young democracy, and the more because of the Slav temperament. Many who would vote for a republic in Serbia or Croatia or Slovenia might cast their votes in favor of a monarchy in the united Jugoslavia.

There are, of course, factors which for the present defy analysis. The four years of war have ushered in a new world. For the Jugoslavs the four years equal a century of previous experience, and their decisions on many questions will be made on the basis of the experience most recently acquired. In the past they have been so separated that free discussion or exchange of ideas was impossible, and even yet their views have not crystalized into clear and definite convictions. They cannot well adopt a federal form of state, because the present division into numerous provinces was the work of enemies whose aims were directly opposed to the welfare of the Jugoslavs; and freedom and unity will create a strong reaction against an unhappy past. If, instead of federation, there are formed administrative districts similar to the French departments, they will have need of large autonomous power to deal with local needs. The work of the constituent assembly may contain more than one surprise, but the Constitution of Jugoslavia will certainly rest upon the broadest possible democratic basis.

Canada and the United States

By J. A. STEVENSON

THERE was something of irony in the fact that the year in which the Canadian people expected to join their American neighbors in an extensive celebration of one hundred years of peace between the two peoples should see the beginning of the bloodiest conflict of history and find the Dominion promptly involved in it. The war burst upon Canada as she was sadly reviewing the final stages of the great boom which had enormously enhanced her material prosperity and debased not a little her social and political values. Widespread liquidation was in process, and many of the real estate aristocracy were reverting to honorable rural careers. There was serious unemployment, the crop was moderate, politics were mediocre and unsatisfactory, the British investor was critical and wary, and it was generally recognized that a stern house-cleaning was inevitable.

When the war came, there was no hesitation on the part either of the country or of the Government. Sir Wilfrid Laurier pledged the cordial support of the Liberal Opposition, and the Borden Government proceeded with its plans to aid the common cause of liberty. Starting with a contingent of a full division, Canada in the course of four years enlisted over half a million men and was maintaining over 150,000 in the field in the final stages of the war. Prior to the great convulsion, militarism had been at a sorry discount in the Dominion. The national temper was strictly civilian, uniforms and military titles were alike scarce, and the common talk was of wheat and real estate, not of campaigns and courts-martial. To-day, colonels and captains abound in the land, crippled warriors hobble along every street, and half the men between twenty and forty-five have a working familiarity with military affairs. There are more than 50,000 Canadian dead in France and Flanders, and nearly 220,000 casualties in all.

Canada has in truth been through the dark valley of sacrifice, and she could not emerge from it without great changes in her national outlook and spiritual fibre. Moreover, she has undergone material and political transformations; woman suffrage has come, national prohibition is being tried, and government ownership of a vast railway system is an accomplished fact. The majority of Canadian factories turned their energies to war work, and in its accomplishment new methods and practices were widely introduced. Before the war, large sections of the Canadian people were scarcely aware of the existence of their Federal government in the intervals between election campaigns, but of late the hand of the state, with its innumerable edicts and restrictions, has lain heavy upon them. Heretofore, political and social progress was slow and difficult, because large numbers of the people had scant contact with thought and education; but the war and its bi-products have conferred enlightenment and new ideas on a variety of subjects, not only upon the active participants in the struggle, who have enjoyed the experience of contact with other lands and peoples, but upon the whole community which was compelled to find fresh bearings. It is a new Canada which takes up once again the pursuits of peace. The old alignments and shibboleths of politics are gone for her better citizens, old traditions and methods alike in business and public life have been discarded, and everywhere one feels the impulse towards further change and improvement.

What will be the future of this new Canada, and what will be its relations to its nearest and dearest friends, Great Britain and the United States?

There was a time during the war when the United States was a stiff neutral, and seemed to anxious British and Canadian eyes to be committed permanently to an attitude of chill detachment from their troubles and trials. Resentment and criticism in Canada waxed fierce, in conversation at least if not in the press, and a Toronto American, who renounced his original citizenship with studied publicity, succeeded in becoming for the moment almost a national hero. For the last century the most permanent and troublesome factor in Canadian politics has been the inveterate prejudice against the United States, inherited by many Canadians from United Empire Loyalist ancestors. Time and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

again it has been skilfully traded on by interested protectionist groups to defeat all efforts for closer trade relations; the 1911 reciprocity election was the last and worst example. The prejudice made every arbitration award, however morally fair and legally just, a source of grievance, and kept alive a smouldering fire of distrust and jealousy which found its outlet at intervals in spiteful editorials and foolish speeches. Not that the faults and provocations were all on the northern side of the boundary; American statesmen and editors were all too rarely discreet in their comments upon Canadian affairs. At no time during the last century was there any real imminence of active hostilities, but there was too much back-biting and too little neighborliness. Canadians rated Americans in the mass as patronizing and conceited, and were in turn set down as querulous and bumptious.

At one time it seemed as if the Canadian army, destined inevitably to influence the national life for some decades, might return with a half-won war and terrific losses to perpetuate the anti-American tradition and give it new life. But the day that the United States entered the war as an active combatant saw the dissipation of that unhappy prospect, and freed Canadian Liberals from what has been and seemed likely to be one of their worst handicaps. Toryism and reaction in Canada have always battened on the anti-American sentiment. Of the two historic parties at Ottawa, the Conservatives have always laid special stress on the imperial tie and British connection, with the strong reservation of local protection, while the Liberals have been the North American party, insisting at all times on Canadian autonomy and consistently advocating closer trade relations with the United States. To-day, the common sacrifices on the battlefields of Europe have forged new ties between the two North American democracies, which bid fair to endure and to repair the stupid blunders and bickerings of the past. Never has there been such free and wholesome intercourse between the two countries. America has been flooded with Canadian veterans assisting in recruiting enterprises and liberty loan campaigns, and scarcely a week passes but some well-known American addresses a Canadian Club or other audience. Canada has maintained an extensive cohort of representatives at Washington, and American sociologists and officials visit Ottawa freely to gain insight and information into the best method of dealing with the problem of crippled and discharged soldiers. Mr. Gompers addresses the Canadian Parliament, and Canadian Ministers grace the festivities of American conventions. In France, the Canadian and American armies are said to evince a pleasing and intelligible partiality for one another; they favor the same sports, talk the same vivid slang, and encourage the same democratic *camaraderie* between officers and men. Besides, in the Canadian army there were at least 50,000 recruits from the United States, some expatriated Britons and Canadians, but many also native-born Americans impatient to reach the battleground. If the stream of agricultural emigrants from the Western States to the Canadian Northwest has diminished in volume since 1914, it still flows on and has been responsible for the chief accession to Canada's population during these years. Proportionately, the American element in Canada has increased, and if there is no renewal of British immigration on a large scale, Canada may have to rely on her neighbor for English-speaking immigrants to hold the balance of British civilization and culture against the French-Canadian and eastern European particularisms.

All these bonds of communion and intercourse cannot fail to modify appreciably and to exercise an excellent influence upon the future relations of the two countries. Exactly what, however, those relations will be is an interesting speculation. If the league of nations comes to fruition, it is safe to assume that Canada will insist upon having separate representation at its board and will decline to enter as a fractional subdivision of a unified British imperial sovereignty. The continuance of Prussia as an autocratic military despotism was the only force that could have welded the British commonwealth into an organic union, and now that the German menace may be assumed to have vanished, the case for imperial centralization loses all its force. The reasons which will impel Canada to a fuller assertion of her national individuality are various but clear. There is an underlying sense that she has too often in the war and during the past been treated by the mother-country more as a vassal than as a sister state; there is a feeling of new pride and self-dependence generated by her soldiers' valor; there is a recognition that the internal cohesion which Sir Wilfrid Laurier strove for and which Premier Borden has needlessly impaired, and which is to-day Canada's most serious need, can best be secured by an intensification of Canadian nationality and a more completely authoritative Canadian Parliament. We may therefore expect to see Canada emerge in the next decade as a full-fledged sovereign state, subject to the limitations imposed by the league of nations if that comes to pass.

What effect this advance will have upon that golden link of empire, the British Crown, is a matter of difficult surmise. Mr. H. G. Wells would be quite certain of one remedy, and there may be other alternatives for a country whose upper classes are so profusely insistent on their "loyalty." Has not the King of England many sons, sufficient to provide a monarch for each Dominion which desires to adhere to the system of constitutional monarchy? However, there must in any case soon be an end of the system whereby Governors-General for the Dominions are nominated by the British Government; there will be a transference of their selection to the Dominion Cabinets, which will probably insist on creating native-born viceroys. But if Canada is to possess separate representation in the league of nations, it must obviously have full freedom without reservations to record its vote on the merits of each case, even if that vote is contrary to the predilections of the mother-country's delegates. It is an acute, if unexpressed, fear of this contingency which creates a deep hostility to the principle of the league of nations in imperialist circles in England. But if the statesmen of the British commonwealth cannot work out some scheme of coöperation on the lines of a free Britannic alliance without any relics of the old dependent status for the Dominions, Canada will slowly but surely take her own path, without any unpleasant quarrel but along the lines of a political evolution which is inevitable.

A change to complete autonomy and full statehood would assuredly have the sympathy of the people of the United States, and might have deeper effects on the relations of the two countries. At recurring intervals there have been movements on both sides of the border for political unification. The sponsors of each movement have ordinarily called their project "union," and the opponents, in Canada at least, have termed it "annexation." There was the serious manifesto of the enraged Tories in the late forties, when Great Britain abolished preference on adopting free trade; and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

there was the formidable movement of Erastus Wiman and Goldwin Smith in the eighties. Read Goldwin Smith's book, "The Canadian Question," to-day, and the arguments for union are hard to answer.

In 1911 a wealthy Canadian magnate made a parade virtue of his bitter hostility to reciprocity by declaring that its enactment would double the value of his holdings in Canada. Complete union would certainly simplify the organization of North American life; it would secure valuable economies by abolishing many duplications of service and unnecessary officials at the frontier. It would peculiarly simplify the transportation problem for both countries in certain regions, and would be of manifest economic advantage to the workers and producers of both countries. Canada would gain a vast market and the United States would have assured sources of food supply. It would in the end be as sensible and profitable an arrangement from the economic point of view as the union between England and Scotland has proved itself to be. But the centralization of all North American life under one governance would have drawbacks as well as compensations. It would create a mammoth and exceedingly unwieldy state, and accentuate a tendency to uniformity of type in the individual which is an unfortunate feature of life on this continent.

Strange to say, what little talk there is in Canada to-day of the prospects of political union with the United States comes from strange quarters—from "big business" rather than from cosmopolitan idealists. A Conservative Senator lately gave in private conversation the following multifarious reasons for his inclination to favor eventual union with the United States.

Imprimis, if the two countries had to pool their war debt, the Canadian burden would be easier. Second, the organized farmers of the western provinces were threatening the sacred tariff and planning an alliance with disloyal Quebec to destroy it. The American people, now that the safe and sane Republican party was in control of Congress, would be too sensible to discard their enlightened fiscal system. Third, Canada must go to the American financial market for new capital, and would secure better terms if the two nations were under the same flag. Fourth, if American manufacturers were assured of perpetual access to the great markets to the south of the Canadian border, they would cross the border in droves to take advantage of Canada's vast resources of cheap water-power. Lastly, but not least, Britain was obviously on the high road to Bolshevik Socialism, and the less contact Canada had with her politically the better for the financial *status quo*.

But the Senator was obviously a man who lived by bread alone, and it would be absurd to proclaim these as the common views of the average Canadian capitalist. What will assuredly come within the next few years is the carrying to completion of the reciprocity treaty, which was foiled in 1911. The western farmers still clamor for it and the Liberals have practically decided to make it part of their next election programme. A wide extension of its scope could be made to yield most of the advantages of political union. At the table of the league of nations the American and Canadian representatives will almost always be found working hand in hand. It happens that both nations, by reason of their cosmopolitan populations which give them racial ties with all European countries, and their detachment from strategical problems and outworn theories of power and prestige, are preëminently fitted to take a leading part in the new political organization of mankind for which liberal spirits hope to-day.

Correspondence

The President of the Chinese Republic

Peking, December 6

MR. HSU SHIH-CHANG is the fourth President of the Republic of China. The first President was Yuan Shih-k'ai, a soldier, with acknowledged administrative ability, with some insight into international relations, and with some perception of the fact that the best friends of China were the liberal rather than the military Powers. He made a stupendous miscalculation in the last few months of his life, and his death, like that of Pichegru, was most unexpected but most opportune—from many points of view. The second President was Li Yuan-hung, also a soldier, who had been at the head of the revolutionary armies when they were on the point of being defeated by the Imperial armies which, for lack of financial support, had to declare stalemate and accept, somewhat sulkily, the peace that was framed at Shanghai between representatives of Yuan Shih-k'ai and the revolutionaries. The whole of General Li's public career was a chapter of accidents, a chapter largely written by his own lack of political experience and his assumption that everybody else was as bluffly honest as himself. After an *opéra bouffe* monarchical restoration, General Li was succeeded by Feng Kwo-chang, another military man, who had been one of Yuan Shih-k'ai's lieutenants. General Feng never became anything more than Acting President, though he had been duly elected Vice-President. As Acting President he displayed all the weaknesses of the soldier who, unfitted for political life, takes to politics. To these three succeeds Mr. Hsu Shih-chang, a civilian.

Mr. Hsu Shih-chang had been in the public service for many years before the revolution and came eventually to occupy the highest positions in the Empire open to talent. He had a great reputation as a scholar. He had been a tutor to the boy Emperor. So intimate were his relations with the Imperial house that he was often the go-between in its dealings with the Republic. Mr. Hsu's personal affection and respect for the members of the Imperial house have been so well known that extreme radicals have wondered whether his accession to office might not be only the prelude to another attempt at a Manchu restoration. At the present moment it may truly be said that no such suspicion or shadow of suspicion is entertained by any sane mind in this country, and Mr. Hsu's position, in spite of immense difficulties, is now perhaps surer than that of any of his predecessors, even half-way through their period of office.

When Mr. Hsu, after considerable hesitation, which may be ascribed partly to the Chinese customary frequent refusal of gifts or offices and partly to the fact that Mr. Hsu was feeling his way, accepted the office of President, there were many factors in the political situation that would have deterred even the boldest man from accepting office. In the first place, the country was divided. In Canton there was sitting an extraordinary Parliament, which was as a matter of fact the Parliament that had been elected in the early part of 1913. After sitting in Peking for a year it had been dismissed by President Yuan on the ground that its membership consisted largely of persons implicated in a seditious movement; then, having been recalled on the death of President Yuan, it had spent a year in conflict with the Government and eventually had been dismissed by President Li, at the bidding of General Chang Hsun who engineered the Manchu twelve-day restoration. The duration of this Parliament had already expired by limitation, and it was therefore technically an unconstitutional body, although it has all along insisted that it represents the constitutional principle and that as soon as it is recalled it will pass emergency legislation which will pave the way for its own dissolution. Over against this extraordinary Parliament was a Parliament in Peking. This Parliament was elected on the basis of an electoral

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

law which had been amended practically at the dictation of the northern military men, and its constitutionality, in consequence, was a good deal in doubt. It would be improper to say that the Peking Parliament was packed, for it contained a number of men who throughout have shown some independence, and on the whole has as a body shown more independence of the northern military men, whose creation it was, than might have been expected.

Not the least of President Hsu's difficulties has been that he was elected to office by the Peking Parliament, and whatever of constitutional incapacity attached to that body attached also to the President elected by it. His strength lay in the fact that he had the courage to grasp the nettle. The Acting President was at the end of his term and had become thoroughly weary of Presidential responsibility. Somebody must act: "the King's Government must go on," as they say in English constitutional practice. The whole national position had become one of utter constitutional chaos. The only constitutional factor remaining was the Acting President, who to this moment, by the way, is technically Vice-President; but he had practically "struck work" for a multitude of reasons. It was, therefore, necessary for somebody to step into the breach and hold the Presidential reins, even if irregularly. Mr. Hsu, with fine courage, took up the reins.

Having been irregularly elected to office, Mr. Hsu had to make his position regular. This he has not yet done, but he is on the way to doing it. The first stage in the regularizing process is to bring peace in China, and to do this he had first to bring the two parties into a conciliable frame of mind. The northern party consists very largely of military men who have lost all patience with the extreme democracy preached by the south. The attitude which they take is that China is not ripe for the extreme democracy championed by the south, and in this they are probably right; but they are indubitably wrong when they see as the only alternative to democracy the whiff of grapeshot. Their political conceptions are practically limited to the whiff of grapeshot, and President Hsu had to convert them to a saner view. He set to work very carefully. He had an enormous advantage over most of the military Governors in the fact that both in years and in public service he was their senior, and also in that he was a man of letters. The reverence for letters is not dead in China; twelve years of educational chaos cannot kill tradition twenty-four centuries old. President Hsu first of all got rid of the chief soldier in the north, the Prime Minister, General Tuan Chi-jui. It was done with extreme politeness, but also with considerable firmness. He then invited the military Governors of the provinces to Peking, and had confidential talks with them in which he pointed out that fighting had been going on, in a more or less desultory way, for over a year, that neither side was any nearer a solution of the issue, and that the country was being ruined by the disorganization of trade and the constantly increasing burden of foreign debt, the latter required to make good a deficit of five million dollars a month. To bring the military men round to his side was the work of six weeks; then he was able to issue a mandate that the northern forces were to withdraw to their own territorial areas.

All this time he had been using every influence he had with the south. The extraordinary Parliament in Canton warned him that if he accepted the Presidency from an illegal body like the northern Parliament he would entirely forfeit their respect, and after his acceptance of office and his inauguration the threat was made good in a resolution declaring war against him. Nevertheless, through trusty representatives he was all the time inducing a more moderate frame of mind in the south, and eventually the Administrative Council of the Canton Military Government—the name of the executive arm of the extraordinary Parliament—issued a mandate instructing the forces of the south to cease hostilities.

This was the point that had been reached, or almost reached, when the armistice in Europe was signed. The effect of that armistice was immediately felt in China. It was realized that the Allied Powers had won, that militarism was a discredited thing, and the adherents of the whiff of grapeshot view had all of a sudden to adjust themselves to new conditions. They bungled, of course; and the continued stay of the military Governors in Peking, as a body, on one excuse or another, caused grave anxiety. The more timid section of the public feared a *coup d'état;* others feared that the President had taken vipers to his bosom and would very soon be stung by them. At the least, it was thought, the military men would stay to dominate the nomination of a new Cabinet, and that meant that the new Cabinet would be a military Cabinet.

Just in the nick of time the god appeared out of the machinery. The Allied Powers presented, simultaneously to the President in Peking and to the representatives of the military Government at Canton, an *aide-mémoire* calling attention to the fact that civil strife had been raging for two years, expressing the anxiety of the Allied Powers as to the eventual effect of this on the welfare of China, and recording their pleasure at the indications that both north and south were about to set aside mere personal sentiment and technicalities and, by frank conference, reach an accommodation that should serve to bring the chaos and disorder of the past two years to an end. The *aide-mémoire* wisely erred on the side of assumption. The two sides had come very near to accepting a conference, but there was still a little doubt. The *aide-mémoire* removed it. The morning after it was presented, the President called a conference of all the military Governors still in Peking, of all the members of the Cabinet, and of many high officials, and placed the text of the *aide-mémoire* before them. The military men saw at once that they had lost the game, and their chief, General Tuan, admitted that it would be wise to try pacific methods. The *aide-mémoire* could mean only one thing, namely, that if the two factions in China could not find a settlement between them it might be necessary for outsiders to find one. This was not said, it was not even implied. It was not necessary that it should be either said or implied.

There is every prospect, then, of domestic peace in China within a very short time; but President Hsu's difficulties will be by no means at an end. Peace will be only the end of the first stage. In the second stage will come the re-establishment of constitutional forms. It is admitted that the provisional Constitution is very defective, and that the drafts of the final Constitution so far worked out are also open to serious criticism. It will be the work of the peace commission, which it is expected will shortly meet at Shanghai or Nanking as the result of preliminary negotiations between representatives of President Hsu and of the Canton military Government, to find means by which a new constitutional start can be made. What is to happen to the two Parliaments? What is to be President Hsu's constitutional position? What is to be the form of the emergency legislature and of the permanent legislature? Are all the irregularities of the past two years to be wiped out by a general bill of indemnity, or are the offenders to be divided into sheep and goats? The constitutional issue has a thousand complexities.

While these problems are being settled, other pressing problems must be faced. Who is going to pay the country's bills? In spite of the fact that the Allied Powers have suspended their claims on the Boxer Indemnity, and that the payments to the Central Powers lapsed on the declaration of war, thus releasing a score of millions of dollars of Chinese revenue annually, there is at present, as has been said, a monthly deficit of five million dollars. The larger part of this arises from the fact that while there is an enormous drain on the treasury for the support of troops nominally engaged in the war against the south, very few provinces are sending in their matricular contributions. The cessation of the strife means, of course, that the Government can disband many of the troops now under enlistment, but that may result only in an increase in the brigandage now rampant in the country. Disbandment, accordingly, must be very gradual, and in any event the army will be for

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

some time a heavy burden. Even if the whole army could be paid off to-morrow, there would still be a heavy bill to face. Within the past two years China is estimated to have borrowed $200,000,000 from Japan. Many of the loan transactions by which this new indebtedness has been incurred will not bear criticism. The loans have been obtained nominally for industrial purposes, but it is almost impossible to point to an instance in which the money has been used for the purpose for which it was borrowed. Practically, this huge debt has been unproductive. In the realm of finance alone President Hsu has an enormous problem to solve.

Fortunately, the President has given evidence that he realizes the imperative needs of the country. He has issued mandates urging the direction of energy into industrial and economic channels; he has more than once insisted upon the need for an education that shall fit the citizen to add to the economic strength of the nation, and he has given proof of his thorough belief in democracy and in the liberty of the citizen on which democracy is founded. He is holding up at the present moment a drastic press law, which originated with the militarists; and to show his sympathy with the press he has given a reception to the journalists in Peking, and has issued invitations to leading journalists from the provinces to come to Peking, at his expense, so that he may meet them. He has given several receptions to all classes of people in Peking, and on each occasion his unassuming manners and the freedom with which, while maintaining his dignity, he has mingled with his guests, have produced a most favorable impression. His conduct as President, during less than two months of incumbency, has been such as to dissipate, probably forever, any fear that he may lead the way in a monarchical restoration; and to the pessimism which prevailed two months ago has now succeeded a spirit of optimism such as has been unknown in China for three years.

W. Sheldon Ridge

WHAT purports to be a letter from the Kaiser to the Czar, written in 1915 and printed by the Russian official newspaper *Isvestia*, contains the following contribution to German parliamentary history: "My Reichstag is manifesting a cursed bad leadership, for it swings back and forth between the Socialists, who are supported by the Jews, and the ultramontane Catholics. In my opinion both parties ought to be hanged man by man."

The
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS
Section

of the *Nation*, containing articles on international questions, English texts of important documents, selected editorials and other matter from the foreign press, and news notes of events throughout the world, is issued fortnightly with the coöperation of the following

Advisory Council

André-Louis Chevrillon, Paris.
Winston Churchill, Windsor, Vermont.
Stephen P. Duggan, College of the City of New York.
The Rt. Hon. Sir George Foster, Ottawa, Canada.
John A. Hobson, London.
Henry Goddard Leach, American-Scandinavian Foundation.
John Bassett Moore, Columbia University.
Gilbert Murray, Oxford.
Rómulo S. Naón, Washington.
Joseph Reinach, Paris.
James Harvey Robinson, Columbia University.
Jacob H. Schiff, New York.
Oscar S. Straus, New York.
Frank A. Vanderlip, New York.

The International Relations Section is sold only in connection with the *Nation*.

Documents

A Proposed Declaration of National Rights

THE proposals which follow form the concluding portion of "A Memorandum Stating the Case for an Immediate Declaration of National Rights for the Subject Peoples of Europe, to Form the Charter and Basis of a League of Nations and Proposing a Method for its Achievement," issued by the Irish League of Nations Society, Dublin. The earlier portion of the Memorandum, which is dated October 5, reviews the action already taken by the Society in favor of a league of nations, comments upon the statements of President Wilson and Mr. Balfour on the same subject, and considers "what measures, if any, can be adopted to provide the 'great reforming machinery' which, according to Mr. Balfour, must be brought into operation before a 'league of nations' becomes practical politics," and which "must be capable of rapid assembly and operation if the Allies are not to flounder into a political morass in which civilization may be finally imperilled."

The proposal now submitted in outline is:

(1) That the British, American, French, and Italian Governments should respectively appoint small special national advisory conferences.

(2) That such conferences should at once appoint representatives to meet and prepare an agenda of national problems.

(3) That all the conferences should concurrently consider a common agenda.

(4) That all national conferences shall have before them formal and reasoned public statements of the claims of majorities and minorities—e.g.,"Ulster"—among communities who claim increased powers of self-government.

(5) That the proceedings of all the conferences should be published in the world's press, and that they should be in daily telegraphic intercommunication with each other.

(6) That the representatives appointed to prepare the agenda should remain at some central point to act as a central information bureau and clearing-house for all the conferences.

As an extension of the same method Japan, Russia, Serbia, Rumania, Belgium, Greece, and even Bulgaria and the neutral Powers, might appoint national conferences to consider and advise upon the same agenda. In order to secure rapid action in the first instance, and to ensure dispatch in subsequent proceedings, the central bureau should remain under the management of representatives of, say, four or five of the great Allied Powers.

[Note.—Should a general peace conference assemble at an early date, it would provide the necessary central authority to prepare the common agenda and coördinate the work of national conferences.]

It is unnecessary here to discuss at any length the number of members to constitute the various national conferences. These would vary in each country. The British Empire conference, in addition to containing representatives of the various interests in the United Kingdom, would have to include representatives of the self-governing Dominions and would, therefore, probably be larger in number than those of France or Italy with their single Parliaments.

As a general principle, each conference should be as small as can be made consistent with its competence and representative capacity. In each case organized labor should be represented, and competent members sought outside the membership of existing legislatures.

One obvious, though superficial, objection may be anticipated. "Why," it will be asked, "should not the existing Governments themselves undertake the functions proposed for the conferences?"

BALDWIN-WALLACE COLLEGE
LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The answers are, first, that Governments are necessarily absorbed in the conduct of military operations and domestic administration; secondly, that their responsibilities and traditions would effectively forbid that full, free, and public exchange of suggestion and opinion which is the essence of the whole proposal; and, thirdly, that the intense, continuous, and untrammelled concentration of the mind of every member of the conference will be required for the discharge of their function—to give birth to a new international principle and a new international order.

Another objection may also be anticipated. "Why," it will certainly be inquired, "not constitute one international conference instead of a number of national conferences?" Any one who has had experience of even a bi-lingual assembly will realize the confusion and congestion of proceedings where interpretation is necessary. Fully developed to represent all the nations, such an international conference would become either a modern Tower of Babel, or be dominated by a few—usually diplomatically expert—linguists. Again, the proceedings of an international conference, however expert or representative, would fail to attract and hold the attention of the world. Consultations upon the most vital points would take place behind closed doors, and the public procedure would lack the great recreative power which would inspire the proceedings of national conferences—the effect of the best minds of the world thinking aloud about the greater human problems.

A Free Trade Manifesto

THE following election manifesto of the British Free Trade Union, signed by Lord Beauchamp as president, was made public on December 5, the election campaign being then in progress.

The Coalition Government has formulated its fiscal policy. It appears to contemplate a general adherence to the principles which obtained before the war, but it suggests three changes of some importance, viz.:

(1) Imperial preference on existing important duties, and on any such duties which for our own purposes may be imposed in future;

(2) some form of fiscal support for "key" industries; and

(3) some form of fiscal legislation to prevent dumping.

The danger underlying these three proposals lies less in what they appear to be in their simple form than in the possibility of their extension to a point which might undermine the structure of our industrial life.

Imperial preference on existing duties is in effect little more than a sham. The Tariff Commission itself showed that in 1905 only £3 out of every £1,000 (three-tenths of 1 per cent.) of imports from the self-governing colonies were dutiable in this country. Without the taxation of food, as Mr. Chamberlain rightly insisted, any satisfactory preference to the colonies is impossible; and its results, so far as any increase or diversion of trade is concerned, will be inappreciable. But preference is apparently to be given to our imports of tea, coffee, wines, and sugar from our Empire abroad, and this may easily produce an unfortunate reaction on our export trade to China, the Dutch East Indies, and the northern portion of South America in particular.

In any case this preference will be injurious to our customs revenue, and is only too likely to open up sources of jealousy and friction within the Empire, with our present Allies, and with neutrals.

What the duties to be subsequently imposed may be it is impossible to say. But this provision opens the door to almost anything; and in spite of the limitation that they are to be "for our own purposes," there is no guarantee that suitability for providing revenue is to be an essential qualification.

Key industries: These are defined by Lord Balfour's committee as "industries on which other and larger branches of industrial production of substantial importance are dependent." This definition seems to be dangerously vague and large, and might be made the pretext for wholesale protection. If, however, it can be shown that industries, the establishment of which is necessary on the grounds of national security, cannot be established or maintained without state assistance, they should be assisted by the state only so far as is necessary for national safety, and on such lines as will preclude undue profits from accruing to private individuals from the state's action. National security and national necessity are supreme considerations, but they must not be exploited for personal gain.

Dumping may be defined as "the sale of goods in the British market at prices lower than those at which the goods are currently offered in the country of manufacture." In so far as this policy may be proved to be an organized effort of foreign producers, aimed at the destruction of an existing British industry, or at the prevention of the establishment of a new industry, free traders will not object to its limitation. But since the tariff reform agitation began no such case has been proved to exist. On the other hand, it is notorious that industries such as the tin plate and confectionery trades have been placed on a much sounder footing by the supply of imported raw materials at unusually favorable rates. If we refuse goods which we want because they are offered at abnormally low prices we may only stimulate, to our own detriment, industries in other countries which take advantage of the offers we refuse.

In any case security is required that steps ostensibly taken to prevent the deliberate destruction of an industry are not in fact used merely to protect those which are too apathetic or feeble to resist honest competition. With dumping, as with key industries, it is essential to insure that the state shall prevent the assistance which it may grant from becoming a mere maintenance of incapacity, or the medium for putting large profits into private pockets.

These are the three main points of the Government's policy, which may be interpreted as amounting to very little, but which are capable of extension to mean a great deal. They may be presented to free traders as protection reduced to absurdity, but to tariff reformers as the thin end of the wedge. It will be the business of free traders to watch them closely, and to make sure that they never lead to much harm.

Beyond this there is the demand, which all lovers of freedom must echo, that, now that the war is over, the recent undesired, though in some cases necessary, control of British industry by Government must cease, and that an end must as soon as possible be put to departmental interference and bureaucratic ways.

It has been clearly demonstrated during the last few years that the state is very ill suited to be the guardian of commerce and industry. Government officials are not, and cannot be, as capable of guiding the threads of trade and industry as private individuals. They do not possess the requisite technical knowledge or the adaptability to meet the constant and rapid changes in economic conditions. The profits of industry do not come to them, and they do not bear its losses. They may thus be easily led to "encourage" a weak and unprofitable branch of industry, because it appears to require assistance, without first satisfying themselves that it really deserves support. And thus the strength of the nation will be wasted, instead of being allowed to divert itself into healthy branches of industry, and so to increase total productiveness.

The only chance of a speedy return to the pre-war prosperity of our foreign trade, which is the basis of our national existence, lies in the competitive power of our export trade in the markets of the world. Nothing must be done to hamper or imperil it, and everything to encourage and increase it, in the years which lie before us. Freedom of imports and of internal trade is the first essential to this end; and the country must resolutely insist on our adherence to the well-tried policy of taxation for revenue purposes only.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Proposed India Reforms

THE subjoined "final statement" regarding the Montagu-Chelmsford proposals for the reform of government and administration in India, taken from the London *Morning Post* of December 11, was issued by the Council of the European Association, an organization comprising "the leaders of British mercantile, industrial, and planting enterprise in all parts of India." The statement points out the dangers of the Montagu-Chelmsford scheme, and continues:

1. The Government should constantly and without apology hold to the excellent principle laid down in the report, whereby demonstration of fitness, and not agitation, should be the means of advance towards self-government for India.

2. If the policy is to be not merely one of associating Indians with the bureaucracy, but definitely one of training in representative government, and if the capacity to work a representative system cannot safely be made real by making Indian Ministers dependent for tenure of office on the vote of non-official members of the Legislative Council, then the policy should be simply one of association, *i. e.*, Indian Ministers should be in effect, within departmental limits, what Indian Executive Council members are in regard to the whole work of the Government. But this is excluded by the aim of the reform report.

3. Communal representation should be granted to Europeans (being British subjects), to important Indian minorities, and to the masses so far as they are given the franchise at all, and voting should, wherever possible, be direct.

4. The questions of electorates and of departments to be transferred should be considered together, and in transferring departments thought should be given to the undesirability of eventually presenting the British official element in the Government as identified with taxation and punitive measures while the Indian ministerial element monopolises more benevolent duties.

5. The proportion of vacancies in the Indian Civil Service thrown open to Indians competing in India should not exceed 25 per cent. until at least ten years have elapsed, and the superior grades of the Police Service should continue for ten years to be recruited as at present.

6. No change should be made in the constitution of the Government of India until the provincial experiment has yielded some instructive results.

7. So long as Great Britain is responsible for the defence of India, the British element should markedly predominate in the Government of India.

8. Since the object is to give India self-government and not government by an oligarchy, the mere success of departmental transfer of power with ministerial tenure of office depending on the will of the legislature, though an indispensable condition of progress towards representative government, should not be regarded as sufficient to justify the grant of full self-government, which should be postponed till the expansion of electorates thoroughly guarantees the interests of the backward majority of the Indian peoples.

9. In view of the probability of the final stages of the transition being accelerated, on account of the increasing difficulty of exercising a few reserved powers when many have been transferred, earnest attention should forthwith be given to the grave problems of defence and internal order which will present themselves during the latter part of the transition, and a definite policy in this regard should be made public before the scheme of reform is introduced as a bill into Parliament.

10. In initiating and encouraging progress towards representative government, the possibility of the real people of India developing another ideal of self-government, such as that of a federation of Indian States, should be kept in view, and the main endeavor should be to foster qualities and aptitudes which must prove beneficial to India, whatever her political future, rather than to force on a system which may eventually prove unacceptable to the bulk of the Indian peoples.

The Council adds that the inquiry should not have been undertaken until peace conditions obtained; that it should have been conducted by a commission or committee instead of by the Secretary of State and the Viceroy; and that an issue involving the future of a huge population for whose welfare the British electorate is responsible ought to have been placed before that electorate.

A Council of Intellectual Workers

THE following address of the German Council of Intellectual Workers recently formed at Munich, said to have been written by Heinrich Mann, the novelist, was published in *L'Humanité* (Paris) of January 8 and in *Le Populaire* (Paris) of January 9.

The Council of Intellectual Workers proposes to itself as its object the revolutionizing from top to bottom of the mentality of the German people. It desires to be neither a political party nor the economic representative of a profession, but a community of thought. It is its part, by means of spiritualized politics, to put our long mechanized public life at the service of moral purposes. It is equally the opponent of all *Realpolitik* which over-estimates the non-spiritual factors, and of a theorizing, remote from reality, which forgets that ideas must rise from a solid foundation of facts to the height bathed in air.

Man as a moral being is for us at once the point of departure and the object of all political activity; every political and economic institution must have reference to him. We therefore declare ourselves the opponents of a state which rests upon force and which degrades man to the rôle of an instrument of the politics of violence; opponents of capitalism which makes man a commodity; opponents of every form of class domination.

We are, rather, advocates of a Socialism which finds its essence above economic interests, in the inner liberation of man. From this there flows, for us, a sequence of political and economic aspirations—a league of peoples on an economic basis, international abolition of military service, creation of the International of the spirit, progressive socialization, fundamental reform of the system of taxation, progressive decrease of hours of labor according to the character of the technique and the value of the product, removal of economic obstacles for well-endowed workers.

But the Council regards it as its highest task to teach to every one self-development and the sense of personal responsibility.

We must be different men, not merely men living under a different Constitution in different economic and social relations. The association of subjects has been destroyed externally. We desire to destroy it internally, in order that the whole people may stand in its place. There must be a change in the relations of man to man: the relations of superiors to inferiors, of producers to consumers, of masters to pupils, should be transformed from the spirit of military subordination to the mutual sense of genuine community.

The trade, the profession, the routine ought no longer to be killing men. This is why education ought to be established on a different basis—on a moral basis. Undoubtedly the education of the intelligence and scientific work cannot be neglected, for they alone create that freedom of spirit which makes an independent judgment possible. But judgment would be a dead thing without spontaneity, and without the dignity that is born of personal experience.

To each age its own value and its own duties. Enfranchisement of the common life of youth. Free expression within and without the school. Facilitation of the choice of a career. Reform of female education. Greater humanization of the education of teachers. Popular universities. Political educa-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion. Extension of every possibility of intellectual and moral development.

The rest, in man, is not accessible to outside influences; this we know. The rest is his own self, which has its source in his own action. But everything which contributes from without to enrich life and to make it profounder and more intimate should be put at the service of the moral formation of man.

Access to works of art ought not to be reserved to a small number of privileged persons; the function of the fine arts administration should be to sift and bring to fruition the best artistic gifts; it should be the same with regard to religious forces.

Thus democracy is for us not a mere list of points in a programme for the external construction of society. Social democracy is for us the awakening of the forgotten feeling of fraternity; it is for us the means of giving to all the faculties the best possibility of development. Let every one realize that to the highest rights and the highest possibilities of development correspond the highest duties: to liberty, self-discipline; to equality, fraternity; to the possibility of self-development, the duty to realize it; to the right of taking part in the state, responsibility for the destiny of the state. Only when the free popular and social state is based upon the responsibility of each individual towards himself, towards his neighbor, the state, and humanity—only then can that revolution of thought, at which we aim, begin.

Just as in former times the glorious term republican meant more than a profession of faith in one form of state, just as it signified the man whose soul was perfectly free, the man who attained to the highest development of himself, so our task should be to inculcate in the man to come this great republican spirit.

An Alsace-Lorraine Proclamation

THE following proclamation, dated November 19, 1918, was issued by M. Léon Mirman, French Commissioner at Metz, "to the Germans remaining in Lorraine." The proclamation was posted in public places in Metz and in other towns in the region. Another proclamation of the same date to "brothers and sisters of Lorraine—citizens of France," was printed in the New York *World* of January 12.

France accepts homage only from those who love her.

I am sure that you will love France as soon as, morally regenerated by a long and wholesome exercise of liberty, you will have become capable of knowing it and worthy of understanding it.

But, to-day, I reject in her name your hypocritical acclamations. I would respect you more if you were silent and sad, wearing with dignity the mourning of your monstrous phantasies.

I demand, I exact of you only one thing—respect for France and her laws. Whosoever attempts to disturb order will be punished. Those among you who conduct themselves in a proper manner will not be molested, and, should such a thing occur, they will receive protection from me against any one whomsoever, in the name of the Republic.

None of you need be troubled at having shown publicly in the past your joy in the temporary successes, and, more recently, your sorrow at the final disaster of your country.

But if France, in the noble pride of victory, remains the servant of justice, it does not forget—and justice makes it a duty not to forget—the crimes of which her children were the victims.

Those among you who approved these crimes will not be prosecuted. If you perceive to-day the moral aberration in which you allowed the guardians of your conscience to involve you, France abandons you with pity to your remorse; if you do not yet understand, she leaves you with disdain in your abject condition.

But for those who have taken part in any crime, there will be other treatment.

(a) All sales of articles belonging to French or Allied subjects, made without the consent of the owners, are null and void. Articles so acquired shall, within twenty-four hours, be returned to the owner who has been robbed or to his representative, or if necessary to the Mayor. After the expiration of the said time the holder of said objects will be prosecuted on the charge of theft. All rights of the owner to damages are reserved.

(b) All persons possessing articles sent from the front and acquired by pillage must, within twenty-four hours, turn them over to the Mayor, who will give a receipt for them. After the said period, the responsibility of the holder will be materially increased.

(c) All persons who, after due inquiry, shall be convicted of having taken part, either by encouragement, or denunciation, or actual participation, in cruelties practised upon a Frenchman, or an ally of France, particularly upon a wounded man, a prisoner, or a refugee, will be arrested immediately and punished according to law. This will be justice!

All officials will remain at their posts until, in each case, I have otherwise decided. All public services are to be maintained; I shall hold the heads [of such services] responsible. Anarchy is the hideous caricature of liberty. The privileges of the working classes are guaranteed on the indispensable condition that they are exercised in an orderly way.

I have spoken.

In the name of the Republic, in the name of France, one and indivisible.

The Declaration of Corfu

THE Declaration of Corfu, adopted on July 20, 1917, by delegates representing the Jugoslav provinces of Austria-Hungary, was signed by Nikola Pashich, Premier and Foreign Minister of Serbia, and Dr. Anto Trumbich, President of the Southern Slav Committee. A Belgrade dispatch of January 6 announced the appointment of Dr. Trumbich as Minister of Foreign Affairs in the new Cabinet of the United Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes. The bearing of the Declaration of Corfu upon the present problems of the Jugoslavs is discussed in the article entitled "Two Problems of Jugoslavia" elsewhere in this issue.

The authorized representatives of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes, recognizing that the desire of our people is to free itself from any foreign yoke and to constitute itself an independent national state, agree in declaring that this state must be founded on the following principles:

1. The state of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes, who are also known as Southern Slavs, or Jugoslavs, will be a free and independent kingdom with indivisible territory and unity of allegiance. It will be a constitutional, democratic, and parliamentary monarchy, under the Karageorgevich dynasty, which has always shared the feelings of the nation and has placed the national will above all else.

2. This state will be called "the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes," and the style of the sovereign will be "King of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes." The state will have a single coat of arms, a single flag, and a single crown, its emblems being composed of the present existing emblems.

3. The special Serb, Croat, and Slovene flags and coats of arms may be freely hoisted and used.

4. The three national denominations will be equal before the law, and may be freely used in public life.

5. The two alphabets, Cyrillic and Latin, will also rank equally throughout the kingdom.

6. All recognized religions shall be exercised freely and publicly; and in particular the Orthodox, Roman Catholic, and Mussulman creeds, which are chiefly professed by our people,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

will be equal and will have the same rights in regard to the state.

7. The calendar shall be unified as soon as possible.

8. The territory of the kingdom will include all territory compactly inhabited by our people, and cannot be divided without injury to the vital interests of the community. Our nation demands nothing that belongs to others, but only what is its own. It desires freedom and unity. Therefore, it refuses consciously and firmly all partial solutions of the problem of its deliverance from Austro-Hungarian domination, and of union with Serbia and Montenegro in a state forming an individual whole.

9. In the interests of freedom and of the equal rights of all nations the Adriatic Sea shall be free and open to all.

10. All citizens shall be equal and enjoy the same rights toward the state and before the law.

11. Deputies to the national Parliament shall be elected by universal suffrage, with equal, direct, and secret ballot.

12. The Constitution, to be established after the conclusion of peace by a constituent assembly elected by universal suffrage, will be the basis of the life of the state. It will create the possibility of organizing local autonomies. It will come into force after receiving royal sanction. The nation thus unified would form a state of some 12,000,000 inhabitants, which would be a powerful bulwark against German aggression and an inseparable ally of all civilized states and peoples.

The Western Ukraine

THE political aspirations of the people, or of a portion of the people, commonly known before the war as Ruthenians—the Little Russian or Ukrainian populations of parts of Austria and Hungary—are shown in the following "fundamental law" adopted on November 23 by the National Ukrainian Council at Lemberg.

Art I. All territories of the former Austro-Hungarian monarchy in which the great majority of the population are Ukrainians have declared, by the decree of the Rada of October 19 and in virtue of the principle of self-determination, the formation of an independent state to be called the "Popular Ukrainian Republic of the West."

Art. II. This Republic comprises the ethnographically Ukrainian territories of the former monarchy, that is to say, East Galicia, the Bukowina, and the Ukrainian districts of the former Hungarian counties of Zips, Saros, Zemplin, Bereg, and Marmaros.

Art. III. The above-mentioned territory constitutes the Popular Ukrainian Republic of the West.

Art IV. The state shall be governed by the entire population through the medium of an organ of popular representation, elected on the basis of universal, equal, secret, direct, and proportional suffrage. The constituent [assembly] shall be elected on the same basis. Until the time when the latter shall be elected, the governmental functions shall be exercised by the Rada and the State Secretariat.

Art. V. Coat of Arms, gold lion on blue ground; national flag, blue and yellow placed horizontally. The state seal bears the inscription, "Popular Ukrainian Republic of the West."

Contributors to This Issue

VLADISLAV R. SAVICH was formerly the head of the press bureau of the Serbian Foreign Office.

J. A. STEVENSON is a Canadian correspondent of the *Nation*.

W. SHELDON RIDGE is a correspondent of the *Nation* at Peking.

Foreign Press

President Wilson and the French Workers

THE following address, taken from *La France Libre* (Paris) of December 15, was presented to President Wilson at Paris, on December 14, by M. Pierre Renaudel on behalf of the French Socialist party and the General Confederation of Labor. The reply of Mr. Wilson was printed in American papers of the 15th, but the address of M. Renaudel appears not to have been transmitted. The quotation from Mr. Wilson's speech of January 22, 1917 (the second paragraph below), has been corrected to conform to the original.

MR. PRESIDENT: Speaking to the American people and to the world in one of those messages which, by their noble spirit, will in history rise above all the horrors of war, you declared:

"I hope and believe that I am in effect speaking for liberals and friends of humanity in every nation. . . . I would fain believe that I am speaking for the silent mass of mankind everywhere who have as yet had no place or opportunity to speak their real hearts out concerning the death and ruin they see to have come already upon the persons and the homes they hold most dear. And in holding out the expectation that the people and Government of the United States will join the other civilized nations of the world in guaranteeing the permanence of peace upon such terms as I have named, I speak with the greater boldness and confidence because it is clear to every man who can think that there is in this promise no breach in either our traditions or policy as a nation, but a fulfillment, rather, of all that we have professed or striven for."

The General Confederation of Labor, which numbers a million of organized workers, and the Socialist party, which had at the beginning of the war one hundred deputies in Parliament representing one million three hundred and ninety thousand citizens, are desirous of proving to you that your hope of being able to speak for the masses who heretofore have been silent will not be disappointed.

In taking part in your reception at Brest, the General Confederation of Labor has already shown you the deep harmony of thought which exists between the French workers and the President of the United States regarding the conception of war and of peace.

The organizations whose delegates are now speaking to you, Mr. President, would be sorry if they were reproached with imposing upon you a meddlesome patronage. Such behavior, which would be frivolous in your presence, would be discreditable to them.

But how is it that they have not taken the trouble to make known to you that thousands and thousands of the men, women, and children of France, the "silent masses" whose ancestors so often fought for the rights of citizens, are with you in determining the rights of nations and realizing a peace of the peoples?

You have graven, in ineffaceable lines that will not be forgotten by the memory of men—of the men whose interests are neglected by the acts of the diplomatists—the terms of a just, humane, and lasting peace.

How could the people refrain from signalizing their gratitude?

France threw herself completely into the war because she knew that she was attacked. The soldiers went away saying, "We wish that this war were the last." It is not sufficient for them that France and her Allies should have vanquished the aggressor. "The silent mass" expects that its heavy sacrifice will be compensated by the organization, at the proper time, of a world peace based on principles contrary to all those which constituted the danger of militarism and imperialism.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A tremendous undertaking, which will not be the work of a moment, but for which statesmen can only sow the fruitful seeds at the peace conference, and count forthwith on the good-will of the peoples to prepare the ground for beneficent harvest.

An inevitable task, the moral principles of which you have defined at the same time that you bring to Europe the admirable material coöperation of the American nation.

For this task, which is symbolized in the society of nations, how can we refrain from saying as you pass that the most ardent of democracies turns towards you?

It is not a mere accident which brings to you to-day the workers, the Socialists and Democrats of France.

Since February, 1915, at London, the workers and Socialists of France have been declaring that while, together with the workers and Socialists of other allied countries, irrevocably determined to fight until victory is secured to accomplish this task of liberation, they are not less resolved to combat any attempt to transform this war of defence into a war of conquests which would prepare new conflicts, create new grievances, and subject the peoples more than ever to the double yoke of armaments and of war.

Convinced that they have remained loyal to the principle of internationalism, they entertain the hope that very soon, recognizing the identity of their fundamental interests, the proletariat of all countries will find themselves united against militarism and capitalistic imperialism.

The victory of the Allies ought to be the victory of the liberty of peoples, of unity, of the independence and autonomy of nations in the peaceful federation of the United States of Europe and of the world.

Later, in another conference held at London in February, 1918, when more than three years of war, bringing sadness and destruction, had already passed over the world, the workers and Socialists of France again declared:

"Of all the conditions of peace none is so important for all the peoples of the whole world as that there shall be no more war in the future. Whoever the victor, the peoples will be the losers if an international régime is not established to prevent all war. Of what use would it be to proclaim the right of peoples to self-determination if that right were at the mercy of new outbreaks, if it were not protected by a supreme international power which can be none other than a league of nations?"

By a solemn agreement, all states and all peoples involved in that outcome ought to give assurance that disputes which may arise among them will be settled by arbitration.

The refusal of arbitration or of a decision [under arbitration] will be proof of premeditated aggression, and all the peoples will then of necessity make common cause, by all means at their disposal, economic or military, against any state that refuses to recognize the arbitration agreement or breaks the universal pact of peace.

But the loyal acceptance of the rules and decisions of the international organization implies thorough democratization in all countries.

Elimination of all absolute powers which, up to now, have taken the responsibility of choosing between war and peace; parliamentary assemblies elected by and for the sovereign right of peoples; abolition of secret diplomacy, and in its place a foreign policy subordinated to the control of the legislative assemblies; publication of all treaties, which ought never to be in contravention of the stipulations of the league of nations; absolute responsibility of Governments of all countries, and especially of the ministers of foreign affairs, to their parliaments: such a policy alone will permit of the sincere abandonment of every form of imperialism.

In connection with such a general extension in a world in which effective international guarantees prevent all aggression, the society of nations will result in entirely eliminating force as a means of settling international conflicts.

Then, for the French workers as for you, Mr. President, the world ought to be safe for democracy.

It is with this in view that you have stated your fourteen peace points.

They have brought together in explicit declarations the Allied Governments.

They have dazzled the peoples by their pure light.

They have penetrated the troubled conscience of the German people themselves.

They have contributed to the stirring up of the German revolution, as a punishment for the crimes of imperial Governments.

The peoples, all the peoples, now expect that a speedy peace will enforce and define the fourteen points, so that the reconstruction of the world may at last be seriously begun.

It will not be the least service which you have rendered to humanity, Mr. President, that you have not found yourself able to withhold the explanations which, a little later, will inspire the peace conference.

Your presence will help to bring to a happy end the nightmare of the peoples, and to prepare a lasting peace in a world where the organization of work will be carried on by the free and loyal coöperation of all the democratic peoples of the earth.

That is what the cheers which have greeted you mean.

That, Mr. President, without disguise or reservation, speaking frankly, as you speak yourself and as you would like to be spoken to, is what the great bodies of workers and Socialists of our country have just said to you.

In Praise of the Censorship

IN view of the growing volume of criticism of the censorship, the following letter to the editor of the London *Times*, published in the issue of November 20, is not without interest. So far as announced, the British commercial censorship still continues.

Sir: It is hardly necessary for me to say that I am in entire agreement with Lord Northcliffe and Lord Burnham as to the need for the speediest possible termination of the press censorship.

But, as the managing director of a commercial paper, I cannot but see that there is great force in the view put forward in to-day's issue of the *Times*, that a too speedy relaxation of the censorship of commercial cables may result in grave injury to Allied interests. The British control of the cables was a weapon the power of which was not realized before the war either by ourselves or by our enemies. It has done us marvellous service in promoting the efficiency of our blockade, as cases heard in the Prize Court show, and as Earl Stanhope acknowledged last Friday in the House of Lords. The secret of its potency is the fact that it gives us power to survey the trade of the world; and, as a result of that survey, to facilitate those activities which are in our interest, and to impede those which are not. But it is obvious that a weapon of this kind is readily adaptable to different, yet analogous, uses during the reconstruction period. Thus, a maintenance of control will enable us to prevent our enemies from cornering the markets of the world against us by making contracts for *post bellum* delivery. Moreover, if our enemies were allowed to cable freely, their messages would congest our lines, and our traders would be hampered in their efforts to make contracts for those raw materials which we all so urgently need. It is therefore essential that, during the reconstruction period, this powerful weapon of cable control should not be wholly scrapped. How it should be organized is, of course, a question for the authorities who have worked this department during the war. For the present the commercial interest of the country demands that it should, in some form, continue to exist. Yours, &c.,

P. A. GILBERT WOOD,
Managing Director of the *Architect*, late Vice-President Institute of Journalists.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Press Censorship in France

THE Paris *Temps* devotes one of its leading articles, in its issue of January 4, to a sharp attack upon the censorship of the press which still obtains in France.

Little by little, abroad, the Allied nations are seeing the return of the normal press régime. Some of them, indeed, had never on essential points abandoned it. The English and American papers, for example, continued to appear with their innumerable pages, and the "blanks" of the censorship were unknown there. In the United States, President Wilson has declared, the peace discussions will be publicly reported and freely discussed.

In France, on the contrary, a censorship, doubtless grown milder and approaching its end, can nevertheless not quite refrain from making its ferule felt from time to time. But it is in form even more than in substance that our press feels itself mutilated and trammelled. Freedom of advertisements for foreign countries has just been reëstablished, but we are the last to achieve the suppression of this in any case dubious measure. In England, where liberty of the press has the force of a dogma, advertisements continue to be free and the national interests of Great Britain do not appear to have suffered. In Italy, it is almost a month since the prohibition of advertisements disappeared.

But above all it is the form of the papers which in our country is still miserably mutilated.

France, *alone in Europe,* continues to be subjected to restrictions at this point which other countries no longer know or which they have never known. The German papers have continued to appear with their imposing mass and their numerous daily editions; the English and American publications have imperturbably maintained their abundant pages. What! for France alone is there no paper to be found? Is France alone to continue to have a poverty-stricken press; and are her papers to continue to be obliged—for how much longer?—to appear, some of them twice a week, some of them three times a week, as a single fly leaf? She alone is to suffer the humiliation of having parsimoniously measured out to her that modern means of diffusing her thought which is the most powerful and the least expensive—the means of the press. . . .

It is time to restore to the French press the situation to which it has a right. How is it possible with the increasing influx of news, coming from all quarters of the globe and more important every day, to insure its publication while the régime which now cripples the papers persists? France formerly gloried in leading the nations in the free expression of ideas. At the moment when Paris is to become the radiating centre of the great nations of the world, do we wish to present the persistent and saddening spectacle of a press that suffers eclipse two or three times a week?

A New French Party

A NEW political group, made up of elements drawn from the groups of the Democratic Left, the Republican Federation, the Republicans of the Left, and the Radical Left, has recently been formed in the French Chamber of Deputies. The following extracts from its programme are given in *L'Homme Libre* (Paris) of December 24.

In regard to political questions, the education of the democracy requires the largest exercise of liberty of speech, press, education, meeting, and association. No limit other than the necessity of safeguarding public order should be able to defeat the right of citizens to organize or form unions.

Liberty of thought and liberty of conscience should be protected from all attack. The reciprocal liberation of the civil power and the religious power should bring to an end the era of their secular conflicts.

The principles of laicism, and the guarantee of the mutual respect which opinions and beliefs owe to one another, should not be the subject of dispute; moreover, they should not be distorted by a sectarian application; they are not directed against any belief; they are the safeguard of liberty.

In regard to economic questions, France will renew and increase her prosperity by the utilization of her natural resources. It is not the function of the state to take the place of private initiative.

Capital and labor are solidary. This solidarity involves for the workers equitable remuneration and the constant and progressive continuance of improvement in their condition. Statism (étatisme), like collectivism, would not effect the emancipation of the proletariat.

Sound finance is indispensable to the economic activity of the country. On the other hand, sound finance will be the fruit of general prosperity. But a better revenue from taxation, even with the help of a judicious limitation of expenses, will not insure a budgetary balance. Without resorting to spoliation, the necessary revenue must be demanded of all forms of wealth and of financial participants in concessionary undertakings.

In regard to social questions, individual property guarantees the independence of human personality, but a just society should insure to each the help of all. Acquisition of property, saving, coöperation, and mutuality must be encouraged; social insurance and provident and philanthropic institutions must be developed.

Every Frenchman should have security for the morrow for him and his, and the gratitude of the nation ought especially to be shown towards large families. At present, what is needed most of all is the generous fulfillment of the fraternal duty imposed upon victorious France toward the victims of the war.

Italy and the Jugoslavs

SIR ARTHUR EVANS, one of the leading English authorities on the Balkans, writing in the *Manchester Guardian* (December 24) on "Italy and the Jugoslavs—A Dangerous Situation," discusses the policy of Baron Sonnino in the light of the secret Treaty of London and the Pact of Rome.

There was . . . every hope that, when hostilities ceased, the two peoples might approach the difficult questions of their relations on the Adriatic side in a friendly spirit. But it very soon appeared that, whatever lip-service the Italian Foreign Minister had rendered at the time to the agreement arrived at, his policy did not deviate a hairbreadth from its old lines. It is needless here to dwell on the evidences of Baron Sonnino's hostile attitude that have already been exposed in these columns —the licence still, alas! accorded to the "Nationalist" section of the Italian press (so severely censored on the other side) to pursue its campaign of rancor against the Southern Slavs, the arrest and detention on two separate occasions of the Slav envoys dispatched in order to arrange for the seizure of the Austro-Hungarian fleet, the backstairs negotiations with Austria-Hungary itself, the internment of the Jugoslav troops who had surrendered that they might fight as on other fronts for the Allies, and, finally, the pressure put on the Allied Powers to continue to refuse to grant that recognition to the Jugoslav Government that had been freely given to the Czecho-Slovaks. And when at last the British and French Governments—hindered thus from giving a formal recognition—made a public pronouncement in September last of their sympathy with the cause of South Slav union, the policy of the Italian Foreign Minister was frankly disclosed. He held his allies to the letter of their bond and still required his pound of flesh. He asked, in other words, for a renewed acknowledgment of the validity of the Treaty of London. That Metternichian document presupposed the existence of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a strong Austro-German Power on the Adriatic shores, and implied conditions that now belong to a vanished world. But though this instrument had been rendered *de facto* obsolete by the public adhesion of the Italian Ministers to the Pact of Rome, our diplomacy, by some strange neglect of the opening given, had failed to take advantage of these declarations. It necessarily followed that the only official answer that could be given to Baron Sonnino's demand was that the French and British Foreign Ministers "respected their signatures."

There is, however, a very essential feature in the case. The Treaty of London . . . is a purely unilateral instrument on the part of the three Governments concerned, dealing with property to which they had no title, and in its very nature, therefore, as it stands, it is without international validity. It had been kept concealed (at the request of the Italian Government) not only from the Jugoslavs themselves but from our Serbian ally, whom it so greatly affects. Prince Alexander of Serbia, in recently accepting the Regency of all the South Slav peoples, has been fully justified, therefore, in proclaiming that the now united kingdom is in no wise bound by it, and that it will with all its strength oppose the execution of those clauses which threaten the integrity of its legitimate national boundaries.

The Pact of Rome, on the other hand, was welcomed on both sides. It is not a secret document disposing of others' property, but an open accord between peoples regarding what is their own to dispose of. In one very important quarter, indeed, it has already received what amounts to official recognition. I am informed that the terms of the pact were at the time communicated, on the part of the Italian Government, to Mr. Lansing, and that the United States has therefore direct cognizance of it. . . .

Baron Sonnino's special organ, the *Giornale d'Italia*, now puts forth the extraordinary plea that this pact was concluded "under the influence of panic", that the complete victory over Austria has now enabled Italy to execute her full programme without let or hindrance, and that therefore the time has come for its formal denunciation! It is satisfactory to record that these pronouncements have called forth protests from organs of Italian moderate opinion, such as the *Secolo* and the *Corriere della Sera*. To the credit of Italy, moreover, it must be said that the first proposals for a friendly understanding with the Southern Slavs were made *before* the great disaster of Caporetto. In any case, the melancholy fact remains that the whole conduct of the Italian Foreign Minister's policy has been in violation of the spirit of the Rome agreement. The armistice thus took place at a time when, instead of the conciliatory dispositions that it was designed to promote, the attitude both of the Italians and Jugoslavs has been turned once more to fierce antagonism. And, as if the mischief done were not in all conscience serious enough, the fact that the lines of the armistice terms were made to correspond with those of the secret treaty—that not only Croat and Dalmatian islands but whole mainland tracts containing a compact Jugoslav population were included—created a fixed impression in the minds of those whose country was thus partitioned that the arrangement was intended to be permanent.

War Graves

THE following statement of the plans of the Imperial War Graves Commission, of which the Prince of Wales is president, is taken from an account of a meeting of the Commission published in the London *Morning Post* of November 29.

Among other matters which were discussed, the Commission had before them two important questions: first, the bringing into the cemeteries of bodies buried in isolated graves on the battlefields, and, secondly, the exhumation of bodies, whether in isolated graves or in cemeteries, in order to transfer them to their native countries. The Commission recognized the existence of a sentiment in favor of leaving the bodies of the dead where they fell, but in view of the actual conditions regarded it as impracticable. Over 150,000 such scattered graves are known in France and Belgium. In certain districts, notably those of Ypres and the Somme battlefields, they are thickly strewn over areas measuring several miles in length and breadth. These areas will shortly be restored to cultivation, or possibly afforested, and the bodies can not remain undisturbed. They must therefore be removed to cemeteries where they can be reverently cared for. The Commission felt that any other course would be excessively painful to relatives and discreditable to the country, and would place the cultivators of the land throughout an enormous extent of territory in a most unfair position. They accordingly resolved to apply to the French Government for permission to gather these bodies into cemeteries as close as may be to the places where they lie. It was announced that the army was arranging for this work to be done by volunteers from among the comrades of the fallen, and that the re-burials would be conducted by the chaplains with the Forces, while the Graves Registration officers would ensure accuracy of identification.

With regard to the removal of bodies to their native countries, the Commission were aware of a strong desire in a small number of cases that such exhumation should be permitted; but the reasons to the contrary appeared to them overwhelming. To allow removal by a few individuals (of necessity only those who could afford the cost) would be contrary to the principle of equality of treatment; to empty some 400,000 identified graves would be a colossal work, and would be opposed to the spirit in which the Empire had gratefully accepted the offers made by the Governments of France, Belgium, Italy, and Greece to provide land in perpetuity for our cemeteries, and to "adopt" our dead. The Commission felt that a higher ideal than that of private burial at home is embodied in these war cemeteries in foreign lands, where those who fought and fell together, officers and men, lie together in their last resting place, facing the line they gave their lives to maintain. They felt sure (and the evidence available to them confirmed the feeling) that the dead themselves, in whom the sense of comradeship was so strong, would have preferred to lie with their comrades. These British cemeteries in foreign lands would be the symbol for future generations of the common purpose, the common devotion, the common sacrifice of all ranks in an united Empire. This view has already been expressed in some of the overseas Dominions, and the Commission were strongly of opinion that it would commend itself to the large majority of the British people as the higher and nobler course.

The following statement regarding inscriptions was issued by the Government Press Bureau on December 5:

The Imperial War Graves Commission understand that there is some uncertainty in the mind of the public as to the inscriptions that will be placed on the headstones in the war cemeteries, and they hope that the following statement will make the matter clear to all who are interested.

On each headstone there will be inscribed the appropriate religious symbol, which will be, for instance, the cross for Christian and the sign of David for Jewish graves; the badge of the regiment or other unit to which the officer or man belonged; and his name, rank, regiment, and date of death. The Governments of the different states of the Empire have decided that they should bear the cost of providing these headstones and inscriptions.

In addition, however, relatives will be allowed, if they so desire, to have inscribed at their own cost a short text or verse chosen by themselves.

It would appear that some misapprehension has arisen as to the limitations imposed on these personal inscriptions. The matter was carefully discussed at the last meeting of the Com-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mission, when it was recognized that considerations of space made it essential that the inscriptions should not be more than three lines in length. Moreover, the Commission, as the authority responsible for the cemeteries, felt bound to reserve to themselves the right of rejecting proposals that for one reason or other were plainly unsuitable. But, subject to these conditions, the Commission wished it to be clearly understood that they had no desire to exercise any censorship in a matter in which they fully recognized that personal feelings should be in every way respected, and that they were anxious to give all possible consideration to the wishes of relatives in regard to the words which were to be inscribed on the memorials of their dead. There is no intention of limiting inscriptions to quotations from the Bible or the Prayer Book.

Demobilization and a Peace Loan

HORATIO W. BOTTOMLEY, the editor of the English weekly *John Bull* (London), writing in the issue of December 28, urges that a large loan will be needed for industrial reconstruction.

In the matter of demobilization the Government will find itself up against a mighty proposition. To some extent the problem has been simplified by the eleventh-hour recognition of the necessity for maintaining a large army of occupation in Germany to counteract any contemplated *coup* on the Kaiser's part. . . . But even then there will be at least three million men suddenly transferred to civil life, to say nothing of the hundreds of thousands of munition and other war-workers whose work is now slackening off, and many of whom will shortly be entirely dependent on the temporary unemployment allowance. And this applies to women as well as to male workers. Let it always be remembered that one of the conditions upon which an enormous number of men rushed to the colors was that their jobs would be kept open for them on their return. We know now that in most cases this promise will not be fulfilled, and we cannot wonder that great bitterness exists in the minds of the disappointed soldiers. Then there is the fact that, after four years of training, we have a veritable army of women in the industrial field, and it will be a matter of difficulty to induce them to return to the humdrum conditions of pre-war life. How, then, does the Government propose to deal with this big question? There is one way, and one way only. Whether or not we get our money back from Germany, there must be a peace loan, of at least one thousand millions, for the purposes of industrial reconstruction. *And every citizen must be compelled by law, according to his means, to subscribe.* That is a kind of capital levy of which I am heartily in favor. And, by the way, our rich men should be afforded the opportunity of proving their patriotism by lending a portion of their wealth to the state free of interest.

The issue of this peace loan should be one of the first acts of the new Parliament, and in the meantime a comprehensive scheme for the profitable utilization of the money on national purposes should be prepared. The roads and highways of the country should at once be taken in hand—special thoroughfares for motors, as distinguished from horse traffic, being provided. Our whole canal system should be overhauled—the various waterways being linked up, with standardized locks. This, by the way, was one of the first promises made by Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman when the Liberal Government assumed office at the end of 1905, and later on we had the inevitable Royal Commission—whose report was in due course made. Nothing, however, has been done in the matter. Under a scientific scheme, highly interesting and well-paid work would be provided for hundreds of thousands of men for several years to come. Then, too, we want a new system of light railways, with motor services attached, for the purpose of dealing with the agricultural produce of the country and bringing it to market at cheap rates. Another matter is the demolition of all slum properties, and the erection in their places of healthy, habitable homes. Concurrently with this we must have a replanning of congested towns and cities. Electric power and lighting should also be taken in hand by the public authorities—our rivers, and even our tides, being brought into service for generating purposes. Upon some such lines as these a new face would be put upon the whole of Britain in the course of the next decade, while . . . the benefit being primarily for posterity, it would be both just and sound finance to treat the peace loan as a permanent charge upon the nation.

Scope for Public Spirit

UNDER the above title the London weekly, *Common Sense,* in its issue of December 21, offers the following suggestions.

There is pretty general agreement now that our ship of state lies sadly battered, drifting in rough seas perilously near the rocks. Many things are needed. We want a stable peace. We want an end of the war in Russia. We want to avert famine from all the peoples of the world. We want to put an end to the vile passions that have destroyed international life and are still scattering bitterness and hatred among the races of Europe.

What can any right-minded man or woman do in this emergency? Most of those who have energy and initiative are so much absorbed in private anxieties that they can give little time or thought to the public weal. But to those who make it a religion to see that their own nation is rightly governed, we may indicate half a dozen avenues of usefulness:

1. Let us do what we can by written and spoken word to support President Wilson's efforts after a peace that will be just and tolerable to all. This is a debt of honor, and upon its fulfillment the future of civilization depends. If the enemy countries should have reason to think they have been tricked and defrauded, there will be no peace worthy of the name.

2. As the suspicion deepens that the War Office, backed by the *Times,* is determined to maintain compulsory service, and as this insidious policy is connected with the determination of imperialists at home and abroad to have an unclean, undemocratic peace, founded on those secret treaties, with crushing indemnities involving an indefinite occupation of Germany, every lover of British freedom should bestir himself to rouse public opinion on this matter.

3. Now that Mr. Winston Churchill, Mr. Douglas Young, the *Times,* and Lord Milner have let the cat out of the bag, there is plenty to be done in spreading information and indignation about the Government's Arctic expedition and its policy of making war on the Russian people.

4. Some may think that the chief fountain of evil is the control of the press, partly through the newspaper bosses and partly through the censorship. To abolish the censorship is a simple and obvious reform. Whether it is possible to deal with the newspaper bosses effectively by law or by taxation is a problem that deserves close and zealous study.

5. Public waste is still on such a scale, and the exploitation of the consumer by prohibitions, Board of Trade licenses, and all kinds of secret, semi-official machinations, is so scandalous and so mischievous that many people may feel inclined to concentrate their energies on endeavoring to secure a prompt restoration of public economy and of complete freedom to trade and business. . . .

6. As to the necessity of purifying the party caucuses by abolishing the sale of titles, by compelling the publication of lists of subscribers, and other salutary reforms, we shall hope for general agreement outside the comparatively small body of interested persons.

These are only suggestions; but whatever the result of the elections the national emergency is so grave that every independent mind should respond to the call.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Notes

IN a recent statement to the joint conference of representatives of the employers' and trade unions' advisory committees in Great Britain, Mr. Winston Churchill, at that time Minister of Munitions, outlined the measures adopted by that Ministry since the signing of the armistice to provide for an orderly reorganization of industry on a peace basis. The three-fold task of the Ministry, he stated, was to arrange for the liquidation of contracts, to assist firms in changing from war to peace activities, and to dispose of stocks of material "in every theatre of war and for every department of state." The employment situation following the shut-down of war industries was declared to be more satisfactory than had been anticipated, and the revival of industry was progressing rapidly. Almost immediately after the armistice was signed all restrictions on the purchase or manufacture of machine tools were removed, and the steel and iron industries were enabled to resume peace production. The Ministry has been making special efforts to obtain orders from Government departments and from the Colonies and Dominions, with a view to stimulating industry. Mr. Churchill deplored an attitude of what he termed "mental Bolshevism," or a "ferocious fury at things in general," on the part of many people, when a spirit of confidence and coöperation would, he believed, insure a period of tremendous business activity following the present transitional stage.

AN important series of pamphlets, of which nine have thus far been received, are being published by the British Ministry of Reconstruction. The general subject of the series is the problem of reconstruction, each pamphlet discussing a specific phase of the question. The nine issues bear the following titles: 1. The Aims of Reconstruction; 2. Housing in England and Wales; 3. The Demobilization and Resettlement of the Army; 4. Housing in Scotland; 5. New Fields for British Engineering; 6. Raw Materials and Employment; 7. Guide to Work and Benefits for Soldiers and Civil War Workers; 8. Resettlement of Civil War Workers; 9. Naval Demobilization.

THE French Minister of Marine is taking measures to improve postal connections between France, Corsica, Algeria, and Tunis. Two new routes are to be opened, one between Toulon and Algiers, the other, to be served for the present by torpedo boats and destroyers, from Toulon to Bizerta, touching at Corsica. A service twice a week in each direction is promised.

A SIGNIFICANT incident of the reception of President Wilson at Paris that received little attention in the American press at the time is reported by *Common Sense* (London), in its issue of December 21. In spite of the prohibition by Premier Clemenceau of a Socialist and trade union parade in honor of President Wilson, a demonstration was organized by the Labor Federation of Mutilated Soldiers. Carrying red flags and singing the International, crippled and mutilated soldiers marched through the streets and broke through several cordons of police and mounted municipal guards that tried to disperse them. The paraders, numbering several thousands, also made hostile demonstrations before the offices of the *Action Française* and the *Matin*.

THE administrative committee of the Confédération Générale du Travail, at a meeting at Paris on January 11, voted in favor of inviting to the international trade union congress the central council of Russian labor unions at Moscow and the central union of the Ukraine at Odessa, and to propose that the international conference take the initiative in calling a labor congress in Russia in case an understanding could be reached with the organizations or individuals concerned. The committee also reiterated its opposition to military intervention in Russia, and declared that the only acceptable policy would be one which aimed to reconcile parties and give effective aid in the economic reorganization of the country in coöperation with the supervising organs created by the revolution. It was decided to appeal to the international conference to express its opposition to military interference on any ground with the internal affairs of any people.

THE purpose of France to maintain a position of influence in the East was emphasized at the Syrian Congress recently held in Marseilles under the direction of the Chamber of Commerce. The programme of the Congress provided for a detailed consideration of the social, scientific, and economic needs of Syria, and its relations with France. The division of the Congress into sections dealing with historical, archæological, geographical, and ethnographical questions, as well as hygiene, the reconstruction and development of industry, and economic conditions, indicates the comprehensive nature of the programme. Sub-divisions of the economic section considered specific questions of Syrian importation and exportation, navigation, public works, banking, agriculture, and natural resources, as well as the economic and trade relations of France and Syria. M. Franklin-Bouillon, president of the Foreign Affairs Commission, asserted that the Syrian question, next to the questions of "Alsace, the Sarre, and the left bank of the Rhine," lay "closest to the country's heart." He assured the Congress that public opinion and the unanimous desire of all parties in France would not permit the Government to waver at the peace conference on the issue of French prestige in the Orient, which must at all costs be maintained.

AS the result of a series of conferences at Ottawa, attended by representatives from all parts of Canada, a comprehensive scheme of public employment agencies under the Dominion Department of Labor has recently been put into effect. The central office of the service is at Ottawa, with two clearing-houses, one at Ottawa and the other at Winnipeg. The provincial Governments are also establishing employment offices and provincial clearing-houses, and local offices are to be opened as rapidly as possible in all industrial centres. The work of the service is subject to the general supervision and advice of a Dominion employment service council, comprising one member appointed by each provincial Government; two members appointed by the Canadian Manufacturers' Association; two appointed by the Trades and Labor congress; one member each from the Railway War Board and the Railway Brotherhoods; two members representing the Canadian Council of Agriculture; three members appointed by the Department of Labor, two of whom must be women; one representative of the returned soldiers organization; and one representative of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Reëstablishment. Each provincial Government may appoint provincial advisory councils made up of equal numbers of employers and employees; and the provinces will also have full autonomy regarding the number and location of local employment offices and, subject to the civil service law, appointments to the staffs. The service is to be free, and available for any man or woman, whether laborer or mechanic, clerical or professional worker. Labor will be supplied to any industry, with the proviso that, in case of strikes or lockouts or pending labor disputes, the employment service is to notify the applicant for help or employment of the conditions existing. This latter provision stands in interesting contrast to the procedure of the United States Employment Service, which is not permitted to supply labor to trades or shops in which a strike is in progress.

THE first issue of a new monthly, "The Pan-American Review," has just appeared. The journal is published by the Pan-American Society of the United States, and is described in the foreword as a "step, not involving any political policy, but intended to develop and conserve mutual knowledge and understanding and true friendship among the American republics and peoples." A combination of personal information and information on governmental, legal, and commercial subjects is pro-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Nation

Vol. CVIII NEW YORK, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1919 No. 2797

General Smuts's Plan for the League of Nations

(Copyright 1919 by the Nation Press, Inc. All rights reserved)

FOREWORD

ALTHOUGH I have had to give the subject of the league of nations a good deal of consideration, this short sketch of it has been hastily written at the last moment, and amid other pressing duties, in view of the early meeting of the peace conference. My object in writing it has been threefold.

In the first place, I wish to help in the formation of public opinion on what will undoubtedly be the most important and far-reaching of all the matters which the conference will have to consider.

In the second place, the discussion of the league of nations has proceeded far too much on general or academic lines; and this, combined with the inherent difficulties of the subject, has helped to create the impression which is unhappily prevalent, that the league is not really a matter of practical politics. To combat this impression I have drawn in rough outline what appears to me a practical, workable scheme.

In the third place, my reflections have convinced me that the ordinary conception of the league of nations is not a fruitful one nor is it the right one, and that a radical transformation of it is necessary. If the league is ever to be a success, it will have to occupy a much greater position and perform many other functions besides those ordinarily assigned to it. Peace and war are resultants of many complex forces, and those forces will have to be gripped at an earlier stage of their growth if peace is to be effectively maintained. To enable it to do so, the league will have to occupy the great position which has been rendered vacant by the destruction of so many of the old European empires and the passing away of the old European order. And the league should be put into the very forefront of the programme of the peace conference, and be made the point of departure for the solution of many of the grave problems with which it will be confronted.

To my mind the world is ripe for the greatest step forward ever made in the government of man. And I hope this brief account of the league will assist the public to realize how great an advance is possible to-day as a direct result of the immeasurable sacrifices of this war.

If that advance is not made, this war will, from the most essential point of view, have been fought in vain. And greater calamities will follow. J. C. S.

16th, December, 1918.

A.—THE POSITION AND POWERS OF THE LEAGUE

During this war a great deal of attention has been given to the idea of a league of nations as a means of preventing future wars. The discussion of the subject has proceeded almost entirely from that one point of view, and as most people are rather skeptical of the possibility of preventing wars altogether the league has only too often been looked upon as Utopian, as an impracticable ideal not likely to be realized while human nature remains what it is. Quite recently the practice of the Allies in controlling and rationing food, shipping, coal, munitions, etc., for common purposes through the machinery of Inter-Allied Councils has led to the idea that in future a league of nations might be similarly used for the common economic needs of the nations belonging to the league—at any rate for the control of articles of food or raw materials or transport in respect of which there will be a shortage. In other words the economic functions of the league would not be confined to the prevention of wars or the punishment of an unauthorized belligerent, but would be extended to the domain of ordinary peaceful intercourse between the members of the league. And it was especially argued that during the period of economic reconstruction following the war, when there would be a shortage of several essential articles, the league would be the proper authority for rationing states in respect of such articles. That, generally speaking, was the utmost extent to which the idea of the league of nations was thought to be applicable.

An attempt will be made in this sketch to give an essential extension to the functions of the league; indeed to look upon the league from a very different point of view, to view it not only as a possible means for preventing future wars, but much more as a great organ of the ordinary peaceful life of civilization, as the foundation of the new international system which will be erected on the ruins of this war, and as the starting point from which the peace arrangements of the forthcoming conference should be made. Such an orientation of the idea seems to me necessary if the league is to become a permanent part of our international machinery. It is not sufficient for the league merely to be a sort of *deus ex machina,* called in in very grave emergencies when the spectre of war appears; if it is to last, it must be much more. It must become part and parcel of the common international life of states, it must be an ever visible, living, working organ of the polity of civilization. It must function so strongly in the ordinary peaceful intercourse of states that it becomes irresistible in their disputes; its peace activity must be the foundation and guarantee of its war power. How would it be possible to build the league so closely into the fabric of our international system?

I would put the position broadly as follows: The process of civilization has always been towards the league of nations. The grouping or fusion of tribes into a national state is a case in point. But the political movement has often gone beyond that. The national state has too often been the exception. Nations in their march to power tend to pass the purely national bounds; hence arise the empires which embrace various nations, sometimes related in blood and institutions, sometimes again different in race and hostile in temperament. In a rudimentary way all such composite empires of the past were leagues of nations, keeping the peace among the constituent nations, but unfortunately doing so not on the basis of freedom but of repression. Usually one dominant nation in the group overcame, coerced, and kept the rest under. The principle of nationality became over-strained and over-developed, and nourished itself by exploiting other weaker nationalities. Nationality over-grown became imperialism, and the empire led a troubled existence on the ruin of the freedom of its constituent nations. That was the evil of the system; but, with however much friction and oppression, the peace was usually kept among the nations falling within the empire. These empires have all broken down, and today the British Commonwealth of Nations remains the only embryo league of nations

EDUCATION LIBRARY

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

because it is based on the true principles of national freedom and political decentralization.

Such was the political system of modern Europe right up to the early decades of the twentieth century. The nations of Continental Europe were mostly grouped into certain empires which were small leagues of nations, keeping the peace among their constituents and incidentally robbing them of their liberties. Leaving aside France and Italy as national states, Russia, Austria, and Turkey were composite empires, embracing the most heterogeneous races and peoples, while the German empire was predominantly national with certain minor accretions from other races. The war has wrought a fundamental change and re-cast the political map of Europe. Three of these empires have already disappeared, while Germany, even if she survives the storms of the coming days, will certainly lose her subject races of non-German blood.

The attempt to form empires or leagues of nations on the basis of inequality and the bondage and oppression of the smaller national units has failed, and the work has to be done all over again on a new basis and an enormous scale. The vast elemental forces liberated by this war, even more than the war itself, have been responsible for this great change. In the place of the great empires we find the map of Europe now dotted with small nations, embryo states, derelict territories. Europe has been reduced to its original atoms. For the moment its political structure, the costly result of so many centuries of effort, has disappeared. But that state of affairs must be looked upon as temporary. The creative process in the political movement of humanity cannot be paralyzed; the materials lie ready for a new reconstructive task, to which, let us hope, the courage and genius of Western civilization will prove equal. Adapting the great lines of Browning, one may describe Europe as lapsing to

> That sad, obscure, anarchic state
> Where God unmakes but to re-make the world
> He else made first in vain, which must not be.

The question is, what new political form shall be given to these elements of our European civilization? On the answer to that question depends the future of Europe and of the world. My broad contention is that the smaller, embryonic, unsuccessful leagues of nations have been swept away, not to leave an empty house for national individualism or anarchy, but for a larger and better league of nations. Europe is being liquidated, and the league of nations must be the heir to this great estate. The peoples left behind by the decomposition of Russia, Austria, and Turkey are mostly untrained politically; many of them are either incapable of or deficient in power of self-government; they are mostly destitute and will require much nursing towards economic and political independence. If there is going to be a scramble among the victors for this loot, the future of Europe must indeed be despaired of. The application of the spoils system at this most solemn juncture in the history of the world, a repartition of Europe at a moment when Europe is bleeding at every pore as a result of partitions less than half a century old, would indeed be incorrigible madness on the part of rulers, and enough to drive the torn and broken peoples of the world to that despair of the state which is the motive power behind Russian Bolshevism. Surely the only statesmanlike course is to make the league of nations the reversionary in the broadest sense of these empires. In this *débacle* of the old Europe the league of nations is no longer an outsider or stranger, but the natural master of the house. It becomes naturally and obviously the solvent for a problem which no other means will solve.

As a programme for the forthcoming peace conference I would therefore begin by making two recommendations:

(1) That in the vast multiplicity of territorial, economic, and other problems with which the conference will find itself confronted it should look upon the setting up of a league of nations as its primary and basic task, and as supplying the necessary organ by means of which most of those problems can find their only stable solution. Indeed, the conference should regard itself as the first or preliminary meeting of the league, intended to work out its organization, functions, and programme.

(2) That, so far at any rate as the peoples and territories formerly belonging to Russia, Austria-Hungary and Turkey are concerned, the league of nations should be considered as the reversionary in the most general sense and as clothed with the right of ultimate disposal in accordance with certain fundamental principles. Reversion to the league of nations should be substituted for any policy of national annexation.

What are these fundamental principles which must guide the league in its territorial policy as the general heir or successor of the defunct empires? They have been summed up for the last two years in the general formula of "No annexations, and the self-determination of nations." There is no doubt that behind them is a profound feeling throughout the masses of the European peoples, and any violation of them will meet with stern retribution. It is for the statesmen of Europe to give political form and expression to this deep feeling. I know that these statesmen will be confronted in their colossal task with conflicting considerations. On the one hand they will be greatly tempted to use their unique opportunity for the aggrandizement of their own peoples and countries. Have they not fought and suffered on an unparalleled scale? And must they quixotically throw away the fruits of victory now that the great opportunity has come? They are now in the position to mould the world closer to their heart's desire; why miss the chance which may never come again in history? That is the voice of the Tempter pointing to a fair prospect. On the other hand that prospect lies beyond a very deep abyss, and only the most callous and foolhardy political gambler will be prepared for the jump. The horrors and sufferings of this war have produced a temper in the peoples which must be reckoned with as the fundamental fact of the political situation in Europe to-day. The feeling of grief, bitterness, disillusion, despair goes very deep; even in the victorious Entente countries that feeling goes much deeper than the more superficial feeling of joy at the final result. How could it be otherwise? The prolonged horror through which all have passed is a far more real, abiding, and fundamental experience than the momentary joy at the end. What has reconciled our Entente peoples to the burdens they were enduring? It was their consciousness of right and their vague hope of a better, fairer world to come which would justify their sacrifices. But if that prospect is rudely blotted out; if the peace really comes, not in the settlement of universal human principles and the dawning of a better order, but in a return of the old policy of grab and greed and partitions, then the bitterness of the disillusion would indeed be complete. Our victory would then become bitterer than Dead Sea fruit. The German battle-front collapsed all the more readily before Foch because the scandalous Brest-Litovsk Treaty had thoroughly disillusioned and demoralized the German home-front. Let Entente statesmen beware of similarly wounding the spirit of their peoples by a peace which gives the final death-blow to their hopes of a better world. For the common people in all lands this war has, however vaguely and dimly, been a war of ideals, a spiritual war. Let not that faith be shattered at the peace. Let the peace be founded in human ideals, in principles of freedom and equality, and in institutions which will for the future guarantee those principles against wanton assault. Only such a peace would be statesmanlike and assure lasting victory. Any other might open the fountains of the deep and overwhelm victor and vanquished alike in the coming flood.

So far I have referred only to territories and peoples split off from Russia, Austria and Turkey. The case of Germany stands on a different footing which is clearly distinguishable in principle. In the first place, if Alsace-Lorraine is annexed to France, that would be a case of disannexation, as it has been

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

put; that is to say, it is a case of restoring to France what was violently and wrongfully taken from her in 1871, against the protests not only of France, but of the population of Alsace-Lorraine speaking through their elected representatives. It is a *restitutio in integrum* on moral and legal grounds, and only in a secondary or consequential sense a territorial annexation. Its restitution to France would therefore satisfy, instead of violating, the moral sense of the world.

In the second place, the German colonies in the Pacific and Africa are inhabited by barbarians, who not only cannot possibly govern themselves, but to whom it would be impracticable to apply any idea of political self-determination in the European sense. They might be consulted as to whether they want their German masters back, but the result would be so much a foregone conclusion that the consultation would be quite superfluous. The disposal of these colonies should be decided on the principles which President Wilson has laid down in the fifth of his celebrated fourteen points. It is admitted that, like Alsace-Lorraine, this is a special case falling outside the scope of the principles applicable to the European and Asiatic communities we are here discussing. For these reasons I restrict the following general recommendation to the peoples and territories formerly belonging to Russia, Austria, and Turkey:

> (3) These principles are: firstly, that there shall be no annexation of any of these territories to any of the victorious Powers, and secondly, that in the future government of these territories and peoples the rule of self-determination, or the consent of the governed to their form of government, shall be fairly and reasonably applied.

When these territories and peoples come to be considered individually it will be found that their conditions for self-determination, autonomy, or self-government vary very considerably. Take, in the first place, the cases of Finland, Poland, Czecho-Slovakia and Jugoslavia as instances. They will probably be found sufficiently capable of statehood to be recognized as independent states of the usual type from the beginning. Take again, in the second place, the Transcaucasian or Transcaspian provinces of Russia. It will probably be found that they are as yet deficient in the qualities of statehood and that, whereas they are perhaps capable of internal autonomy, they will in one degree or another require the guiding hand of some external authority to steady their administration. In all these cases the peoples concerned are perhaps sufficiently homogeneous and developed to govern themselves subject to some degree or other of external assistance and control. This will probably be found to be the case also of Upper and Lower Mesopotamia, Lebanon, and Syria. Although I mention these ex-Turkish territories together as capable of autonomy but not of complete statehood, it must be clearly understood that there is a great deal of variation among them in this respect. At the one end a territory may be found barely capable of autonomy; at the other end the approach to complete statehood is very close. Mesopotamia would probably be a case of the former kind; Syria of the latter.

In the third place, there will be found cases where, owing chiefly to the heterogeneous character of the population and their incapacity for administrative coöperation, autonomy in any real sense would be out of the question, and the administration would have to be undertaken to a very large extent by some external authority. This would be the case, at any rate for some time to come, in Palestine, where the administrative coöperation of the Jewish minority and Arab majority would not be forthcoming; and in the Armenian Vilayets, where Armenian, Turkish and Kurdish populations co-exist in historic enmity, and even the policing of the country would have to be undertaken by some external authority.

In all the above and similar cases where the assistance and control of an external authority is necessary to supplement the local autonomy of the territories in question, that external authority should be the league of nations in accordance with the second proposition above. No state should make use of the helpless or weak condition of any of these territories in order to exploit them for its own purposes or acquire rights over them in the manner which has hitherto been a fruitful source of trouble and war. This may be summed up in the following recommendation:

> (4) That any authority, control, or administration which may be necessary in respect of these territories and peoples, other than their own self-determined autonomy, shall be the exclusive function of and shall be vested in the league of nations and exercised by or on behalf of it.

How is the league to provide this authority or administration? It will itself be a conference consisting of representatives of states. Any authority or administration directly exercised by it will, therefore, be of a joint international character.

Now, joint international administration, in so far as it has been applied to territories or peoples, has been found wanting wherever it has been tried. It has worked fairly well in international business arrangements of a limited scope, such as postal arrangements, the Danube Commission, and similar cases. But in those few cases where it has been tried in respect of peoples or territories it has not been a success. The administering personnel taken from different nations do not work smoothly or loyally together; the inhabitants of the territory administered are either confused, or, if they are sufficiently developed, make use of these differences by playing one set of nationals off against the other. In any case the result is paralysis tempered by intrigue. It may be safely asserted that if the league of nations attempts too soon to administer any people or territory directly through an international personnel, it will run a very serious risk of discrediting itself. It will have to gain much more experience in its novel functions and will have to train big staffs to look at things from a large, human instead of a national point of view; it will have to train its officials taken from various nationalities to work loyally together irrespective of their national interests; it will have to do these and many other things before it could successfully undertake a task requiring fundamental unity of aims, methods, and spirit, such as the administration of an undeveloped or partly developed people. The league may make experiments in some more or less favorable cases in order to gain experience, but further I would not advise it to go at the beginning. The only successful administration of undeveloped or subject peoples has been carried on by states with long experience for the purpose, and staffs whose training and singleness of mind fit them for so difficult and special a task. If serious mistakes are to be prevented and the league is to avoid discrediting itself before public opinion, it will have to begin its novel administrative task by making use of the administrative organization of individual states for the purpose. That is to say, where an autonomous people or territory requires a measure of administrative assistance, advice, or control, the league should as a rule meet the case not by the direct appointment of international officials but by nominating a particular state to act for and on behalf of it in the matter, so that, subject to the supervision and ultimate control of the league, the appointment of the necessary officials and the carrying on of the necessary administration should be done by this mandatary state.

Here, too, the principle of self-determination should be applied as far as possible. No mandatary state ought to be appointed by the league in respect of a people or territory without the consultation of the latter in such ways as the league may consider fair and reasonable. It will be for such people or territory not only to determine generally on the form of its internal self-government, but also on the state from which it will receive such external assistance as may be necessary in its government. The Republic of Georgia, for instance, will as an autonomous state not only settle on its own form of government, but will also indicate to the league from what outside sources it wants additional assistance, and the league will see in how far it is possible to comply with its wishes. In no case ought it to thrust on Georgia or any other territory the outside help of any mandatary unwelcome to it. It is possible that Georgia may after a trial

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of some mandatary become dissatisfied with the latter for reasons which the league may consider good and sufficient, and in such a case it may consider the appointment of some more suitable mandatary if one could be found.

In practice it will probably happen that in most cases the mandatary state in respect of any people or territory will be chosen by the latter on historic grounds. In the case of most peoples not yet risen to complete statehood there is some power which has in the past taken an active interest in their affairs and development. Where such interest has been not merely of a selfish character, old ties of acquaintance or friendship will largely determine the new connection under the old régime of the league. Where, on the other hand, the Power has rendered itself obnoxious or odious by its behavior in the past it could scarcely expect to be nominated as the mandatary state. In such cases, too, the only safe and sound principle for the league to hold on to is that of the self-determination of the autonomous state.

There will however be cases, such as Palestine and Armenia, where for reasons above referred to an autonomous régime cannot be adopted at the start, and where the consultation of the country on the question of its mandatary state is therefore not formally possible. Even in such cases the league will, as far as possible, follow the trend of popular wishes, and not attempt to foist on the population an unwelcome mandatary.

I sum up this discussion in the following recommendation:

(5) That it shall be lawful for the league of nations to delegate its authority, control, or administration in respect of any people or territory to some other state whom it may appoint as its agent or mandatary, but that wherever possible the agent or mandatary so appointed shall be nominated or approved by the autonomous people or territory.

The delegation of certain powers to the mandatary state must not, however, be looked upon as in any way impairing the ultimate authority and control of the league, or as conferring on the mandatary general powers of interference over the affairs of the territory affected. For this purpose it is important that in each such case of mandate the league should issue a special act or charter, clearly setting forth the policy which the mandatary will have to follow in that territory. This policy must necessarily vary from case to case, according to the development, administrative or police capacity, and homogeneous character of the people concerned. The mandatary state should look upon its position as a great trust and honor, not as an office of profit or a posiion of private advantage for it or its nationals. And in case of any flagrant and prolonged abuse of this trust the population concerned should be able to appeal for redress to the league, who should in a proper case assert its authority to the full, even to the extent of removing the mandate, and entrusting it to some other state, if necessary. No pegging-out of claims should be allowed under the guise of the mandate. And by keeping in touch with the affairs of the territories concerned through proper liaison, the league should satisfy itself that its mandates are being carried out fairly and properly. It might also call for periodic reports from the mandatary state. I therefore make the following recommendation:

(6) That the degree of authority, control, or administration exercised by the mandatary state shall in each case be laid down by the league in a special act or charter, which shall reserve to it complete power of ultimate control and supervision, as well as the right of appeal to it from the territory or people affected against any gross breach of the mandate by the mandatary state.

It must be part of this suggested scheme of mandatary control that the mandatary shall in no case adopt an economic or military policy which will lead to its special national advantage. In fact for all territories which are not completely independent states the policy of the open door, or equal economic opportunity for all, must be laid down. In this way a fruitful source of rivalry and friction between the Powers will be removed. Provision must also be made that no military forces shall be formed or trained in such territories beyond what the league should lay down as necessary for purposes of internal police. This will prevent the mandatary state from trying to augment its military resources from the manhood of the territory affected. And in respect of all such territories the league must be responsible, directly or through the mandatary, for the maintenance of external peace. I sum up as follows:

(7) That the mandatary state shall in each case be bound to maintain the policy of the open door, or equal economic opportunity for all, and shall form no military forces beyond the standard laid down by the league for purposes of internal police.

In fact, I would be prepared to go further, and to submit for consideration that this non-military policy should be applied to all independent states arising from the break-up of the old European system. If we are deliberately deciding in favor of a peaceful régime for the future, it seems to me a fair proposition that all newly-arising states shall conform to the new order of ideas, and shall agree, as a condition of their recognition and admission into the league of nations, to raise no military forces and collect no armaments beyond what the league may lay down as reasonable in their case. The result will be that militarism will be scotched *ab initio* in the case of all new states, and a vast impetus will be given to the peace movement all over the world. In such case it will also be much easier for the older states and Powers to adopt a policy of disarmament and reduction of military forces, and the new peaceful policy will become identified with the very constitution of the new order of things. Practically all the independent states arising from the decomposition of Russia, Austria, Turkey, and, perhaps, even Germany, will then have to adopt the new policy and thereby help to entrench peace in the new political system of Europe. It is an idea which seems to me well worthy of our consideration, as more likely to preserve peace than more ambitious measures adopted to keep well-armed and militarily equipped states from coming to blows. I therefore recommend:

(8) That no new state arising from the old empires be recognized or admitted into the league unless on condition that its military forces and armaments shall conform to a standard laid down by the league in respect of it from time to time.

I have said that the acts or charters by which mandataries will be appointed should be given by the league of nations. It must, however, be borne in mind that all the original arrangements of this kind may have to be made by the peace conference before the league of nations is formally constituted. It will, therefore, in all probability be necessary for the conference itself to issue these first acts, doing so in its capacity as the preliminary or preparatory session of the league of nations. And, in general, it may be found necessary for the conference, as the first session of the league, to lay down the general principles or lines on which the peace settlements are to be effected, and to leave the working out of the details, not to another peace conference, but to the league of nations. In this way the continuity between the conference and the league will be duly marked.

So far, I have been discussing the cases of territories which will probably require some degree of internal administrative assistance or control, which it would be difficult for the league to supply at the beginning, and which would have to be made good from the resources of the existing states or powers. There remains another more general problem to consider. Many of the states which will arise from the break-up of the empires will be able to look after their own affairs as new independent states, and will not require any administrative assistance of control. Any questions arising out of their origin and existence will be dealt with by the league itself without delegation to individual Powers. A gigantic task will thereby be imposed on the league as the successor of the empires. The animosities and rivalries among the independent Balkan states in the past, which kept that pot boiling, and occasionally boiling over, will serve to remind us that there is the risk of a similar state of affairs arising on a much larger scale in the new Europe, covered as it will be

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with small independent states. In the past the empires kept the peace among their rival nationalities; the league will have to keep the peace among the new states formed from these nationalities. That will impose a task of constant and vigilant supervision on it. The nationalities of Europe are in many cases, animated by historic hostility to one another; the tendency will be for them to fly at one another's throats on very slight provocation, and we have had sad experience of the danger of a general conflagration which arises from these local outbursts. It is important to bear in mind that but for the active control of the league, the danger of future wars will be actually greater, because of the multitudinous discordant states now arisen or arising. In this and many other respects the league will have a very real role to play as the successor to the empires. It will have to deal in advance with all the numerous sources of trouble and friction which will continue to exist among the small independent nations. Without unnecessary or undue interference in their internal affairs, it will have to watch over their relations *inter se,* and any internal conditions or situations which will directly affect those relations. I therefore make the following recommendation:

> (9) That, as the successor to the empires, the league of nations will directly and without power of delegation watch over the relations *inter se* of the new independent states arising from the break-up of those empires, and will regard as a very special task the duty of conciliating and composing differences between them with a view to the maintenance of good order and general peace.

It is not improbable that this supervision of the new European states will impose the heaviest task of all on the league of nations, at any rate for this generation. But it will have to be performed efficiently, as there is little doubt that the old historic feuds surviving among the European nationalities may easily become a fruitful source of future danger. If the league is ever to be a reality, it will have to succeed in this great task. And it will succeed, if it takes itself seriously and looks upon itself, not as a merely nominal, but as a real live active heir to the former empires, and is determined to discharge the duties of the great beneficent position which has devolved upon it as supreme guardian of the peace interests of humanity.

I have now made a general sketch of the functions which will devolve upon the league of nations in its capacity as the successor to the defunct empires, and of the general lines on which it may have to proceed in dealing with the great territorial questions which must arise from the break-up of those empires. These functions are quite apart from the more difficult question of the maintenance of future world peace, and seem to me to flow quite naturally and inevitably out of the situation of Europe at the end of the war. An organization like the league of nations is imperatively needed to deal with that situation. Europe requires a liquidator or trustee of the bankrupt estate, and only a body like the league could adequately perform that gigantic task.

I am very conscious of the grave defects of the programme for a league of nations here sketched. But my object is not to produce a complete scheme. That would be a vain and impossible task. My object is to sketch a scheme which will be workable in practice and which, while preventing a scramble among the powers for loot, will not be so far in advance of the existing political practice of Europe as to make cautious statesmen reject it at once. My object further is to base that scheme on the recognition of the principles which I consider vital. A modest beginning on the right basis and on the right principles will enable the future to give full development of form and substance to the whole system. The vital principles are: the principle of nationality involving the ideas of political freedom and equality; the principle of autonomy, which is the principle of nationality extended to peoples not yet capable of complete independent statehood; the principle of political decentralization, which will prevent the powerful nationality from swallowing the weak autonomy as has so often happened in the now defunct European empires; and finally an institution like the league of nations, which will give stability to that decentralization and thereby guarantee the weak against the strong. The only compromise I make, and make partly to conciliate the great Powers and partly in view of the administrative inexperience of the league at the beginning, is the concession that, subject to the authority and control of the league, which I mean to be real and effective, suitable Powers may be appointed to act as mandataries of the league in the more backward peoples and areas. That compromise will, I hope, prove to be only a temporary expedient.

Any one who is conversant with the political conditions of the areas affected by the war will be able to form some approximate picture of how this system of a league of nations will work in practice. The European empires will all have disappeared; Germany will have become a truly federal democratic state from which the non-German subjective peoples will have been disannexed and reunited to their parent peoples. New sovereign states, such as Finland, Poland, Bohemia, and Greater Serbia, will have arisen under the aegis of the league. A large number of autonomous states will have arisen, no longer oppressed by their neighbors, but befriended, advised, and assisted in varying degree by individual great states. A smaller number of areas will be directly administered by some or other of the Powers. Over all would be the league as a real live controlling authority, seeing that its mandates or charters are fairly carried out, that there is no oppression of small racial minorities in the larger autonomies or administrations, and that the guarantee of the open economic door and of a peaceful policy in all less developed areas gives no reason for bitterness or rivalry among the great states. I believe such a system is workable, and in it working will remove the most fruitful sources of war and thus in itself prove a guarantee of world-peace, apart from special measures taken to that end.

It was stated above that the British Empire was the nearest approach to the league of nations. It would be interesting to compare the functions here ascribed to the league to the working arrangements of the British Empire. In the first place, in both cases the ultimate authority of common action is a conference of the principal constituent states. In the British Empire the common policy is laid down at conferences of the Imperial Cabinet, representing the United Kingdom, the Dominions and India, while executive action is taken by the individual governments of the Empire. In the second place, the minor constituents of the Empire, consisting of crown colonies, protectorates and territories, are not represented directly at the Imperial Cabinet, but are administered or looked after by the individual principal constituent states referred to, just as it is here proposed that the Powers should under the league look after the autonomous undeveloped territories. In the third place, the economic policy of the open door and the non-military police policy here advocated for these autonomous or undeveloped territories are in vogue in the analogous British crown colonies, protectorates and territories. It is therefore clear that the broad features of the two systems would closely resemble each other. And it is suggested that where the British Empire has been so eminently successful as a political system, the league, working on somewhat similar lines, could not fail to achieve a reasonable measure of success. The principal difference between the two would be that whereas peace in the British Empire is ensured by a common allegiance, in the league it would have to be elaborately provided for by special arrangements.

B.—THE CONSTITUTION OF THE LEAGUE

So far I have not yet referred to any functions and powers of the league of nations in respect of the old established states or Powers. I have been concerned with it solely from the point of view of the defunct European empires. I have advocated the view that the league should occupy the vacant place left by the disappearance of those empires. The greatest opportunity in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

history would be met by the greatest step forward in the government of man. On the débris of the old dead world would be built at once the enduring temple of future world government. The new creative peace world would come to us, not as a fleeting visitant from some other clime, but out of the very ruins of our own dead past. In that way the most exalted position and the most responsible and beneficent functions would be entrusted to the new organ of world government. Its position and its powers would be assured. And there would be a reasonable chance that it would carry out its almost superhuman task of maintaining world peace. The only question is whether it would work, whether it would be successful in its functioning. And that would depend largely on the constitution given to it. I therefore pass on to consider the constitution of the league.

Now in discussing a problem like the constitution of the league of nations we must be careful not to set too much store on past precedents. Our problem is gigantic and entirely novel; its solution will depend, not so much on following precedents never meant for such a novel and complex situation, but on boldly facing that situation and, if need be, creating a new precedent to meet it. The grand success of the British Empire depends not on its having followed any constitutional precedent of the past but on having met a new situation in history with a new creation in law; and as a matter of fact the new constitutional system grew empirically and organically out of the practical necessities of the colonial situation. So it will have to be here. And above all let us avoid cut-and-dried schemes meant as a complete, definitive, and final solution of our problem. Let us remember that we are only asked to make a beginning, so long as that beginning is in the right direction; that great works are not made but grow; and that our constitution should avoid all rigidity, should be elastic and capable of growth, expansion, and adaptation to the needs which the new organ of government will have to meet in the process of the years. Above all it must be practical and be so devised as to be a real working organ of government.

And from this point of view let us proceed at once to discard the idea of a super-state which is in the minds of some people. No new super-sovereign is wanted in the new world now arising. States will here be controlled not by compulsion from above but by consent from below. Government by consent of the governed is our formula. The old empires were ruined by their theories of sovereignty, which meant centralization, absorption, and denationalization of the weaker national constituents of the population. The great league of nations, like the lesser league already existing in the British Empire, will have to avoid the old legal concepts of imperialism in the new world of freedom. We shall likewise have to abandon all ideas of federation or confederation as inapplicable to the case, and not likely to be agreed to by any of the existing sovereign states. We are inevitably driven to the conference system now in vogue in the constitutional practice of the British Empire, although it will necessarily have to be applied with very considerable modifications to the complex world conditions obtaining under the league.

But while we avoid the super-sovereign at the one end, we must be equally careful to avoid the mere ineffective debating society at the other end. The new situation does not call for a new talking shop. We want an instrument of government which, however much talk is put into it at the one end, will grind out decisions at the other end. We want a league which will be real, practical, effective as a system of world-government. The scheme which I have seen and which brings representatives of all the independent states of the world together in one conference to discuss the most thorny of all subjects and requires that their decisions to be binding must be unanimous, is from that point of view not worth discussion. It means that there never will be any decision issuing from the league; that nobody will take the league seriously; that it will not even serve as camouflage; that it will soon be dead and buried, leaving the world worse than it found it.

In endeavoring to find a workable constitution for the league let us, even at the risk of appearing pedantic, begin at the beginning. Government, like thought or mathematics or physical science, rests on certain fundamental unalterable forms, categories, or laws, which any successful scheme must conform to. The division of government into legislation, administration, and justice is fundamental in this sense, and should be adhered to by us in devising this new system of world government. And we proceed to consider what special forms our legislature, administration, and judicature will take under a system where the constituents will not be citizens but states.

We are, in the first place, called upon to decide what we mean by equality in the new system. Will the United States of America count for as much and the same as Guatemala? The question is crucial.

The league will include a few great Powers, a larger number of medium or intermediate states, and a very large number of small states. If in the councils of the league they are all to count and vote as of equal value, the few Powers may be at the mercy of the great majority of small states. It is quite certain that no great Power will willingly run such a risk by entering a league in which all have equal voting power. Will Great Britain be prepared to put her fleet at the mercy of a majority vote of all the other states who are members of the league? The question need only be put to see what the answer must necessarily be. The league is therefore in this dilemma, that if its votes have to be unanimous, the league will be unworkable; and if they are decided by a majority, the great Powers will not enter it; and yet if they keep out of it they wreck the whole scheme. Clearly neither unanimity or mere majority will do. Neither will it do to assess and assign different values to the states who are members of the league. If Guatemala counts as one, what value shall be given to the United States of America? Will it be 5, or 10, or 100, or 1,000? Will the valuation proceed on the basis of wealth or population or territory? And if either of the last two bases is adopted, what about the Powers who have millions of barbarian subjects, or millions of square miles of desert territory? On the basis of population China may be the most influential member of the league; on the basis of wealth the United States of America will have first place; while on the basis of territory the British Empire will easily rank first. But clearly there is no good reason to be assigned in favor of any basis of valuation, and the principle of values will not help us at all. We therefore proceed to look for some other solution of our difficulty.

The general outlines of the scheme to be adopted seem fairly clear. There will have to be a general conference or congress of all the constituent states, which will partake of the character of a Parliament, in which public debates of general international interest will take place. In this body all the states may be considered equal and should vote as states, whatever the number of representatives a state may, subject to the rules of the conference, have delegated to that body. Besides the conference there will have to be a small body called the council of the league, which will be the executive and carry on the ordinary administration of the league.

The functions of the general conference will have to be carefully chosen so as to make it a useful body and to prevent it from being looked upon, on the one hand as a futile debating society, and on the other as a dangerous body whose debates are likely to inflame the slumbering passions of the national populations. I would suggest that the initiative for the work of the conference should be left as much as possible to the council. That work will consist mostly of the following: (a) General resolutions submitted by the council for discussion in the conference which, when passed, will have the effect of recommendations to the national Parliaments, and have no binding legislative character; (b) general measures or codes of an international character dealing with questions like disarmament or world peace or rules of international law which have been adopted by the council and which they desire to have publicly

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

discussed in the conference before being passed on for the approval of the national Governments; (c) discussion of the reports of the various international administrative committees or commissions working under the council to be referred to later. It will be noticed that in all cases the resolutions of the conference will only have the force of recommendations. Even so, however, the conference may be a most useful body and may become a most powerful and influential factor in moulding international public opinion. The league will never be a great success until there is formed as its main support a powerful international public opinion. With that public opinion behind it, it may go confidently forward with its great tasks; deprived of that support all its power for good will be neutralized and nullified. It is therefore essential that it should create a favorable international atmosphere for its work, that an organized public opinion should be formed in favor of the league and its activities. The enlightened public all over the world will have to be taught to think internationally, to look at public affairs, not merely from the sectional national point of view, but also from a broad human international point of view. And the debates periodically taking place in the general conference might well become of immense importance in this great task of forming and educating a strong body of international opinion behind and in support of the league and its work. For the first time in history people will hear great subjects discussed on an international platform, and the narrow national influence of the local Parliament and still more the local press will gradually be neutralized, and a broader opinion and spirit will be fostered.

The representation of the states on such a conference should be viewed largely from this point of view of favorably influencing and educating public opinion in all constituent countries. The Powers should not grudge strong representation to the smaller states as in any case the resolutions will only be in the nature of recommendations to the national Parliaments. Both the Governments and Parliaments of the states might send delegates, and perhaps even parties could be represented by the selection of members on the principle of proportional representation.

The resolutions to be brought up for discussion in the conference should be carefully selected by the council on the principle of avoiding those contentious issues on which national passions are easily inflamed. If wisely guided, both in the choice of subjects for discussion, and by the participation of great international statesmen in the debates, I see no reason why this conference may not become a really useful organ of the league, especially in its educative influence on public opinion.

The real work of the league will, however, be done by its council whose constitution and powers ought therefore to be very carefully considered. This council would have to be a comparatively small body, as it is not possible to have executive action taken and most difficult contentious administrative work done through a large body. How is its membership to be fixed?

In the first place, the great Powers will have to be permanent members of it. Thus the British Empire, France, Italy, the United States of America and Japan will be permanent members, to whom Germany will be added as soon as she has a stable democratic Government. To these permanent members I would suggest that four additional members be added in rotation from two panels, one panel comprising the important intermediate Powers below the rank of great Powers, such as Spain, Hungary, Turkey, Central Russia, Poland, Greater Serbia, etc., and the other panel comprising all the minor states who are members of the league. Each panel will provide two members, who will be selected from it in rotation according to rules to be laid down in the first instance by the permanent members, who will also fix the two original panels. The council will therefore have nine or ten members according as Germany is or is not a stable democratic great Power in future.

The advantage of this constitution is that the great Powers obtain a majority—although only a bare majority—representation on the council and could not therefore complain that their interests run the risk of being swamped by the multiplicity of small states. On the other hand the intermediate and minor states receive a very substantial representation on the league, and could not complain that they are at the mercy of the great Powers.

It is also well worthy of consideration whether permanent representation should not be given to large groups of small states formed for the purpose. Thus all the important states of South America might desire to form a group for purposes of representation on the council. Or a similar group might be formed by all the Balkan and South Slav states, or another by the small states of Northern Europe. The group would always have a representative on the council, but the representation would go in rotation among a panel of important members of the group to be settled by the council. The size of the council would then become somewhat larger, but the advantages of such group representation may in the long run further the ends of the league very much, and the groups might become useful for other purposes besides representation. The subject of such groups could be discussed by the general conference and settled subject to the concurrence of the council. As a further safeguard for the great Powers and small states alike, it might be laid down that no resolution of the council will be valid if a minority of three or more members vote against it; in other words, more than a two-thirds majority will be required to pass any resolution in the council. This limitation will prevent the council from passing a resolution against which there is a strong feeling while it will not, I hope, substantially impair the working efficiency of the council. Should a step considered necessary by the majority be vetoed by a minority of three or more, nothing will be left but for the Powers to negotiate among themselves in regard to the removal of the deadlock, and with a certain amount of goodwill a way out will generally be found.

The Powers represented on the council should send to it representatives of the highest standing and authority. These representatives should be the Prime Ministers or Foreign Secretaries, who, however, should have the right of appointing *locum tenentes*. The constitution of the council is that of a conference of Governments, each preserving its own independence and responsible for its own people. As far as possible the working arrangements should follow the practice so successfully inaugurated at the Versailles Conferences of Prime Ministers in connection with the Supreme War Council. And for the successful working of the council, government representatives of the highest standing and authority will be necessary. On really important occasions either the Prime Ministers or Foreign Secretaries should, whenever possible, attend personally. And, in any case, they should attend one annual meeting at which there should be a free and frank interchange of views and a review of the general policies of the council. It should also be the invariable practice to call in to consultation any state not represented on the council whose interests are directly affected by any decision proposed to be taken by the council. If the most important leaders in the Governments of the Powers attend the sittings of the council as often as possible, and proper consultation of others interested takes place, the council cannot fail to command the highest prestige and authority, and to become the executive committee of the whole body of sovereign states in their international relations and activities. The more confidence it commands, the less will be the inclination among the Powers to enter into private intrigues or understandings apart from the regular machinery of the council, and the smoother will become the working of the new system of world government.

It would be most important to secure as much publicity for the work of the council as possible, and to this end it would be advisable to issue official statements of its proceedings and resolutions, and any other information which is not of a confidential nature. Secret diplomacy should as much as possible be avoided, as one of the causes of wars. The publication of the voting in

LIBRARY
BALDWIN-WALLACE COLLEGE
BEREA, OHIO

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the council on matters involving the peace of the world might operate as a most salutary check on the clandestine ambitions of statesmen, and might, by exposing their game before the world, assist to mobilize public opinion even in their own countries against them.

In its business arrangements the council will follow largely the precedent of the Versailles Council of Prime Ministers. It will institute a permanent secretariat and staff, which will keep the minutes and records of the council, conduct all correspondence of the council, and make all necessary arrangements in the intervals between the meetings of the council. It will create the machinery necessary to carry out the functions which have been assigned to the league in Section A. Joint committees will have to study the conditions in those countries which are committed to the charge of the league as successor to the defunct empires. Close liaison will have to be maintained with the Foreign Offices of all the constituent countries, as well as with the mandatary states who act for the league in controlled or administered areas. Without any undue or irritating interference in the affairs of states, the council will have to keep in touch with developing conditions in all countries under its charge, and to be in a position from first-hand information to make up its mind on those matters which require executive action by the league. It will have to pay special regard to those situations all over the world which may develop differences and troubles of a serious character between states. In fact, the head office organization will have to be like that of a general staff which studies and watches closely all conditions anywhere developing which might call for action or counsel on the part of the league.

International administrative bodies, now performing international functions in accordance with treaty arrangements, should in future be placed under the management and control of the council. Such subjects as: post, telegraphs, and cables (including wireless telegraphy); air traffic; extradition; copyright, patents, and trade marks; trade and sanitary regulations; statistics; weights and measures; monetary matters; navigation of rivers; private international laws; liquor traffic; slave trade; fisheries; white slave traffic—all these have been dealt with by conferences in the past, but they can in future be better dealt with by the league, and its permanent staff should make and control the necessary administrative arrangements.

After peace there will be a new and most important group of matters calling for the study or control of the permanent staff. Thus the due execution of the provisions of the peace treaty will have to be carefully watched. New conditions of free transit by land, water, and air will become necessary, and require regulation and control by the league. Again, President Wilson has raised the two far-reaching issues of the freedom of the seas and the establishment of equality of trade conditions by the removal of economic barriers between members of the league. These are matters of the most complex character and ramifying deep into the existing system of law and trade. If assented to by the other Powers their assent could at the most be only to the general principles. Both subjects will require the most careful study and detailed consideration, especially in their application to the circumstances of various countries. No body could be better fitted for this investigation by its authority and the resources for study which it will command than the permanent staff of the council. Then, again, there is the vast subject of industrial conditions, involving international labor conditions which will call for expert inquiry and statesmanlike handling by the league. All these thorny subjects will call for the appointment of expert committees or commissions on the staff of the league which could prepare the material for a final expression of opinion by the league.

Let no one be alarmed at this formidable list of first-class difficulties which I am lavishly scattering in the path of the league. All these matters, and many more, are rapidly, unavoidably becoming subjects for international handling. Questions of industry, trade, finance, labor, transit and communications, and many others, are bursting through the national bounds and are clamoring for international solution. Water-tight compartments and partition walls between the nations and the continents have been knocked through, and the new situation calls for world government. If the league of nations refuses to function, some other machinery will have to be created to deal with the new problems which transcend all national limits. The task is there; all that is required is a carefully thought out form of government by which that task could be undertaken. It is a unique problem, both in its magnitude and in the benefits for the world which a successful solution will secure. We can only proceed tentatively and hope for very partial success. In that spirit the above scheme is suggested.

So far I have dealt with the first two branches of the constitution of the league—the general conference and the council. There remains for consideration the third branch of judicature. It will, however, be found more convenient to deal with that topic in the next section in connection with the preservation of future world peace.

I would sum up the arguments of this section in the following recommendations as to the Constitution and functions of the League:

(10) The constitution of the league will be that of a permanent conference between the Governments of the constituent states for the purpose of joint international action in certain defined respects, and will not derogate from the independence of those states. It will consist of a general conference, a council, and courts of arbitration and conciliation.

(11) The general conference, in which all constituent states will have equal voting power, will meet periodically to discuss matters submitted to it by the council. These matters will be general measures of international law or arrangements or general proposals for limitation of armaments for securing world peace, or any other general resolutions, the discussion of which by the conference is desired by the council before they are forwarded for the approval of the constituent Governments. Any resolutions passed by the conference will have the effect of recommendations to the national Governments and Parliaments.

(12) The council will be the executive committee of the league, and will consist of the Prime Ministers or Foreign Secretaries or other authoritative representatives of the Great Powers, together with the representatives drawn in rotation from two panels of the Middle Powers and Minor States respectively, in such a way that the Great Powers have a bare majority. A minority of three or more can veto any action or resolution of the council.

(13) The council will meet periodically, and will, in addition, hold an annual meeting of Prime Ministers or Foreign Secretaries for a general interchange of views, and for a review of the general policies of the league. It will appoint a permanent secretariat and staff, and will appoint joint committees for the study and coördination of the international questions with which the council deals, or questions likely to lead to international disputes. It will also take the necessary steps for keeping up proper liaison, not only with the Foreign Offices of the constituent Governments, but also with the authorities acting on behalf of the league in various parts of the world.

(14) Its functions will be:

(a) To take executive action or control in regard to the matters set forth in Section A or under any international arrangements or conventions;

(b) To administer and control any property of an international character, such as international waterways, rivers, straits, railways, fortifications, air stations, etc.

(c) To formulate for the approval of the Governments general measures of international law, or arrangements

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for limitation of armaments or promotion of world peace.

(Its remaining functions in regard to world peace are dealt with in the following Section C.)

C.—THE LEAGUE AND WORLD PEACE

We come now to that part of our subject which has received most consideration and discussion during the war. The stupendous character of this tragedy has forced to the front, as the most important and vital issue before the civilized world, the question whether an end cannot be made to war, whether the resources of civilization are not adequate to the prevention of similar calamities overwhelming and perhaps finally engulfing mankind in future. A great literature has sprung up round this question, and in this section I do not propose to do more than summarizing what seems to me sound and fruitful in this literature, and especially in emphasizing certain points of view which appear to me to be of capital importance.

Now it seems to me that some people expect too much from the new machinery of international arbitration and conciliation which emerges as the chief proposal for preventing future wars. War is a symptom of deep-seated evils; it is a disease or growth out of social and political conditions. While these conditions remain unaltered, it is vain to expect any good from new institutions superimposed on those conditions. Hence it is that I have argued all through this discussion for an inner transformation of international conditions and institutions. If the league of nations merely meant some new wheel to the coach, I do not think the addition worth making, nor do I think the vehicle would carry us any farther. The league must be such as to mean much more than new councils to provide for arbitration and conciliation in future troubles. The new institution of peace must not be something additional, something external, superimposed on the pre-existing structure. It must be an organic change; it must be woven into the very texture of our political system. The new motive of peace must in future operate internally, constantly, inevitably from the very heart of our political organization, and must, so to speak, flow from the nature of things political. Then, and not till then, will the impulse to war atrophy and shrivel up, and war itself stand stripped in all its horrible nakedness, and lose all the association of romance, all the atmosphere of honor, which has proved so intoxicating and irresistible in the past. That is why I am pleading for a more fundamental conception of the league, for a league whose task will not be to stem the on-coming tide with a broom, but for one which will prevent the tide from flowing at all. I hope I have shown the way to such a conception of the league; and if at this unique juncture in the fortunes of Christendom that conception, or something similar, could be translated into a real living institution, this war, with all its untold miseries for the world, will not have been in vain. I believe this war has ripened public opinion for a far-reaching change. As has been well said in an official survey of this subject:

> The experience of the present war has brought all thinking people to see that the intricate development of commercial and financial relations between all the states of the world has given to all nations a common life, and that war between any two Great Powers produces reactions more widespread and violent than anything realized before the present conflict. No war has hitherto involved so many countries at once; inflicted so many casualties upon combatants or losses on civilians; caused such devastation of land and destruction of property; imposed such comprehensive hardship on the world at large. Such limitations of space, time, and destructive energies as once restricted the evils of war have been swept away; and the magnitude of our present calamity may be expected to provoke a corresponding effort to avert its repetition and aggravation, all the more as this war has shown that there is no real palliative short of prevention. Schemes to civilize warfare, to mitigate its cruelty, to restrict its effect have failed to achieve their purpose, even where they were not deliberately set aside, and the unbounded possibilities of modern science have been enlisted frankly on the side of force and might, uninfluenced by any consideration of the moral law. The position of neutrals has been only less unhappy than that of belligerents; never before has it been so difficult for them to maintain their neutrality or to eke out a bare subsistence amid the universal shortage which war has created. Nor is there the old and somewhat cold comfort that war affects only a group of nations, a single continent, or one hemisphere. Even the Old and the New World have become one, and the United States of America have been constrained to intervene in a European quarrel for the sake of the peace of mankind. These conditions have brought home the actual realities and horrors of war to men and women outnumbering many times those personally affected by military or naval campaigns of former years.

The psychological and political effects of this tragedy have been very far-reaching. The spirits of nations have broken under this accumulated strain. The old institutions on which militarism and autocracy flourished lie crumbled in the dust; a great wave of advanced democracy is sweeping blindly over Europe; and the deepest longing has taken possession of the great masses of the people that this horror shall never be repeated. The psychological and moral conditions are ripe for a great change. The moment has come for one of the great creative acts of history.

The question is, can we plant the institutions of peace in the very heart of the European political system? I have already suggested in section A that the anti-militarist régime should be applied, not only in autonomous territories in future coming under the jurisdiction of the league, but also in all new states arising in Europe and claiming admission into the league. But ought we not to go further and apply the system of peace also to the already existing states and to the great powers?

Three proposals have been put forward for general disarmament and have already received a great deal of public attention. They are:

(a) the abolition of conscription and of conscript armies;
(b) the limitation of armaments; and
(c) the nationalization of munitions production.

All three points bristle with difficulties. Let us take them in order.

If conscription or compulsory military service is abolished in the peace treaty what will be the defensive system of states in future? Will it be voluntarism? And will any limit be fixed to the volunteer armies which the states will be allowed to raise? Or will the new system be a militia on the Swiss model, which gives the population primary military training without creating a great military machine that could be suddenly and unexpectedly used for offensive purposes? All these points involve a great deal of complexity and difficulty in detail; and it is quite clear that no cut-and-dried formulae could be adopted or applied in practice. And yet those difficulties ought not to deter the peace conference from giving the subject the most earnest and anxious consideration. I would go so far as to say that while the Great Powers are allowed to raise conscript armies without hindrance or limit, it would be vain to expect the lasting preservation of world peace. If the instrument is ready for use the occasion will arrive and the men will arise to use it. I look upon conscription as the taproot of militarism; unless that is cut, all our labors will eventually be in vain.

In addition to that danger there is the question of expense to consider. The destruction of capital and the impoverishment of Europe during the war has been immense; the burdens of taxation which the people will have to bear in respect of all this dead-weight debt will be such as to leave little margin for expenditure on necessary schemes of social betterment. If this small margin has to be encroached upon in order to provide the funds required for raising, equipping, and maintaining huge conscript forces, the situation will become intolerable; people simply will not stand it, and the menace of the great anti-state movement now finding expression in Bolshevism will become as great a danger as war itself.

In view of this double danger, I would plead most earnestly for the abolition of conscription at the peace conference. Let

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the drunkard sign the pledge, even if we have to look around for some other less dangerous narcotic to soothe him in his troubles. For I admit that it will not be prudent to leave states without the necessary means of self-defence against both internal and external dangers which may threaten their existence. These, however, are matters of detail to be most carefully inquired into and regulated by the league.

In most countries a simple militia system on a scale of numbers and service agreed upon by the league will probably be the best alternative. By periodical reports from the states in regard to the working of the new system, as well as direct liaison between the permanent staff of the league and the military departments of the states, the council of the league could satisfy itself that all goes well and take the necessary precautions against any abuses or evasions which may be disclosed. As the council will represent the states themselves, it is sure to keep a jealous eye on all military developments.

In some countries, however, a voluntary system will be most in accord with past practice and traditions as well as with the geographical situation. This will probably be the case of the United States of America and certainly of Great Britain, for whose overseas possessions an army recruited on a voluntary long-term basis is essential. In the Dominions different systems prevail and will no doubt continue to prevail. Thus Canada and India follow the voluntary system, while the other Dominions have a compulsory militia system on the Swiss model. In these cases, too, the council of the league will after due inquiry lay down the scale of the defensive system, and will in doing so have to be partly guided by the consideration that, with due regard to all the circumstances, the voluntary standing army authorized by it will have no greater offensive power for the purpose of foreign aggression than the militia authorized in other cases. Nice questions will arise and no doubt give ample employment to the gentlemen on the permanent staff; but I see nothing inherently insoluble in the problems presented, so long as states are *bona fide* willing to make the new system workable.

Of the three proposals for disarmament, the abolition of conscription is by far the most important, and it is also the one behind which there will be the greatest volume of public opinion. The feelings against war engendered by the casualties and miseries of this war will tell most strongly in favor of this fundamental reform; and if carried it will set free a mass of productive labor for purposes of reconstruction, which otherwise would have gone to waste in camps and barracks. It is the most important, the most far-reaching in its effects on the peace régime, and the one probably most easy to carry in view of popular feeling. I hope, therefore, that every effort will be made at the peace conference to have it adopted in the peace treaty.

Coming now to the second proposal, viz., the limitation of armaments, I frankly admit that it presents very grave difficulties as a general principle. Two conundrums are at once presented:

(a) what are armaments; and

(b) on what principle can one weapon of destruction be valued as against another of a different kind?

Both questions are at first sight unanswerable. The weapons of war are no longer limited in range and use as in former wars. It is practically impossible, after our experience of this war, to say what things could be excluded from the list of armaments in the broad sense. The war was fought throughout and ultimately won, not only by the usual military weapons in the narrower sense, but by the whole economic, industrial, and financial systems of the belligerent Powers. Food, shipping, metals and raw materials, credit, transport, industries and factories of all kinds played just as important a part as guns, rifles, aeroplanes, tanks, explosives and gas, warships and submarines.

Even if a compromise is suggested here, and the list of armaments selected for limitation is confined to direct instruments of war such as those last enumerated, then the second question arises, how one instrument is to be valued against another? How is an aeroplane valued as against a tank, a Zeppelin against a submarine, a machine gun against a field gun, or a Stokes gun, or a can of poison gas? Unless a whole system of comparative values is settled, the armaments of one state may exceed in striking power those fixed for another state of equal military standing. And new inventions may at any moment upset the apple-cart with all its precious table of values. Is there any way out of these perplexities? In despair of finding a general solution for our question, it may be that the peace conference or the league is driven to consider partial remedies, such as the limitation of the use of the submarine and aerial bombing, the prohibition of poison gas and disease germs, and similar abominations. Such reforms will not, however, touch the main issue, which is not the humanizing of war, but the general limitation of armaments with a view to rendering war difficult, and, in the end, impossible.

The only suggestion I can make is that, if conscription is abolished and militia or volunteer forces authorized for the future defence of states, the scale of direct armament and equipment on a fair basis *for such forces* should be determined after the inquiry by the council, and that, once such scale is determined, it should not be exceeded by any state without permission of the council. The effect will be that a state, say, with an authorized army of 100,000 men will not be allowed to have guns and machine guns and other direct war weapons for an army of 500,000, and so be in a position, by rapid expansion of its army after the outbreak of war, to arm and equip the expanded army to the full. Such a provision seems almost a necessary corollary to the abolition of conscription and the limitation of volunteer or militia forces to definite numbers. Nor does it appear impracticable. Limitation of armaments in this narrower sense is eminently a subject for the experts of the league to thrash out, and it ought not to be beyond their powers to produce a workable scheme for such limitation.

The nationalization of armament factories has been advocated, on the ground that as long as the production of munitions of war remains a private commercial undertaking, huge vested interests grow up around it which influence public opinion through the press and otherwise in the direction of war. There is no doubt that the influence of Krupps has been harmful to the great peace interests of the world, and, in a less degree, the same could probably be said of most other similar undertakings. The very success of that sort of business depends on the stimulation of the war atmosphere among the peoples. The press, influenced by the large profits and advertising enterprise of the armament firms, whip up public opinion on every imaginable occasion; small foreign incidents are written up and magnified into grave international situations affecting the pacific relations of states; and the war temperature is artificially raised and kept up.

This proposal is, in my opinion, a sound one, and should be adopted by the conference or the league. Of course, difficulties have been urged against it. Where are the small states, who are dependent for supplies on the private munition factories in the countries of the Great Powers, going to get their armaments in future? I am not much impressed with this sort of argument. To keep up the high temperature of the war atmosphere over the world for the sake of indulging the small Balkan and other states in their special form of sport will not appeal to the great democracies of the world. It will materially assist the peace policy of the league to cut off the supply of arms and munitions from these small states, whose little fits of temper are too costly to the world, and whose security could be more safely entrusted to the league.

In order to enable the council of the league to keep in touch with the production and movements of arms and munitions, the council should have full rights of inspection of all such national factories, and should, besides, be furnished periodically with returns of the imports and exports of arms and munitions into and from the territories of the members of the league.

It must be borne in mind that, even with this information before it, the council will not be in possession of the full facts.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The important question remains, how soon other private factories engaged in other industries could be converted to the production of munitions, and to what extent the official or state production could thus be increased? I am afraid that, unless inquistorial powers are given to the league, it could not follow up this important aspect of the matter. In all its calculations, however, the council will have to bear in mind that there is this vast reserve capacity of production in the background, a capacity which will be specially great for the next decade because of the great number of munition factories which will now be converted to other uses, and could, in case of necessity, be reconverted to the production of munitions.

This discussion may be summed up in the following three recommendations:

(15) That all the states represented at the peace conference shall agree to the abolition of conscription or compulsory military service; and that their future defence forces shall consist of militia or volunteers, whose numbers and training shall, after expert inquiry, be fixed by the council of the league.

(16) That while the limitation of armaments in the general sense is impracticable, the council of the league shall determine what direct military equipment and armament is fair and reasonable in respect of the scale of forces laid down under paragraph (15), and that the limits fixed by the council shall not be exceeded without its permission.

(17) That all factories for the manufacture of direct weapons of war shall be nationalized and their production shall be subject to the inspection of the officers of the council; and that the council shall be furnished periodically with returns of imports and exports of munitions of war into or from the territories of its members, and as far as possible into or from other countries.

I now proceed to deal briefly with the specific proposals which have been put forward for the purpose of preventing international disputes from developing into wars. The actual scope of most of these proposals is not to prevent wars altogether, but the more limited one of compelling disputants not to go to war before their dispute has been inquired into and either decided or reported upon by an impartial outside authority. This is the furthest limit that most writers have been prepared to go. As long as members of the league submit their disputes for inquiry and report or recommendation or decision by some outside authority, their obligation to the league will be satisfied, and thereafter they will be free to take any action they like, and even to go to war.

This may appear a weak position to take up; and yet it is not deemed expedient to go farther. The utmost that it seems possible to achieve in the present conditions of international opinion and practice is to provide for a breathing space before the disputants are free to go to war; to create a binding moratorium or period of delay, during which the parties to the dispute agree not to proceed to extremes but to await the results of the inquiry or hearing to which their case has been referred. The general opinion is that states will not be prepared to bind themselves further; and even if they do, the risk of their breaking their engagement is so great as to make the engagement not worth while and indeed positively dangerous. The common view is that, if such a period of deliberation and delay is established, there will be time for extreme war passions to cool down, and for public opinion to be aroused and organized on the side of peace. And in view of the enormous force which public opinion would exert in such a case, the general expectation is that it will prove effective, and that the delay, and the opportunity thus given for further reflection and the expression of public opinion, will in most cases prevent the parties from going to war. Thus, although the engagement of the disputants is only to delay action pending the inquiry into or hearing of their case and the issue of a decision or report, the actual effect of the delay will in most cases be more far-reaching, and the threatened war may be prevented altogether.

The moratorium must extend not only for the period of the inquiry and until a decision or report has been rendered, but for a reasonable time after such rendering, in order that the disputants may have an opportunity to consider whether compliance with it is possible. This will also give the council an opportunity for a final effort to secure the adhesion of the disputants to the decision or report. What is a reasonable time for this purpose is a matter of detail which could be left to be settled by the league.

I have assumed that the council will in any case be able to render a report or make recommendations about the dispute. But as a minority of three or more may veto any resolution of the council, the possibility has to be faced that in exceptional cases the council, in spite of all its efforts, may be unable to make a report or recommendation. However regrettable this may be, the delay would have given time for the passions of the disputants to cool and thus have served a useful purpose.

Should states be forbidden to make warlike preparations during the moratorium? On the whole the answer should be in the negative, not only because it is practically impossible to say what warlike preparations are, but also because it may conceivably be in the interest of the innocent party, whose military preparations are behindhand, to use the interval of the moratorium to improve his defences and thus give his aggressive opponent additional food for reflection and caution.

While it is free to a state to go to war after the report or recommendation of the league has been given, it would be monstrous to permit this as against a state which obeys and carries out the recommendation of the league. If such a state is notwithstanding attacked by an unscrupulous opponent, the latter should be dealt with by the league, which could not possibly sit still and have its authority so flagrantly flouted. To sum up discussion I make the following recommendation:

(18) That the peace treaty shall provide that the members of the league bind themselves jointly and severally not to go to war with one another—

(a) without previously submitting the matter in dispute to arbitration, or to inquiry by the council of the league; and

(b) until there has been an award, or a report by the council; and

(c) not even then, as against a member which complies with the award, or with the recommendation (if any) made by the council in its report.

What are the penalties incurred by any party which breaks this covenant to observe the moratorium? This is the most important question of all in regard to the preservation of world peace. Without an effective sanction for the keeping of the moratorium the league will remain a pious aspiration or a dead letter. The forces of public opinion which would be mobilized during the moratorium will in most cases be strong enough to restrain the parties from going to war, but to achieve that object the opportunity of a moratorium must be guaranteed with all the force which is behind the league. The breaker of the moratorium and generally of the covenant in paragraph (18) should therefore become *ipso facto* at war with all the other members of the league, great and small alike, which will sever all relations of trade and finance with the law-breaker, and prohibit all intercourse with its subjects, and also prevent as far as possible all commercial and financial intercourse between the subjects of the law-breaker and those of any other state, whether a member of the league or not. No declaration of war should be necessary, as the state of war arises automatically on the law-breaker proceeding to hostilities, and the boycott follows automatically from the obligation of the league without further resolutions or formalities on the part of the league.

The effect of such a complete automatic trade and financial boycott will necessarily be enormous. The experience of this

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

war has shown how such a boycott, effectively maintained chiefly through sea power, has in the end availed to break completely the most powerful military power that the world has ever seen; and the lesson is not likely to be lost on future intending evildoers. It is because of this power of the economic and financial weapons that many writers are of opinion that the obligation for action by members of the league should not go beyond the use of these weapons. My view, however, is that they will not be enough if unsupported by military and naval action. A powerful military state may think that a sudden military blow will achieve its object in spite of boycotts, provided that no greater military reaction from the rest of the league need be feared. This fear may under certain circumstances be a more effective deterrent than even the boycott; and I do not think the league is likely to prove a success unless in the last resort the maintenance of the moratorium is guaranteed by force. The obligation on the members of the league to use force for this purpose should therefore be absolute, but the amount of the force and the contribution from the members should be left to the recommendation of the council to the respective Governments in each case. It will probably be found convenient, and even advisable, to absolve the small members of the league from the duty of contributing military and naval forces and to be satisfied with their participation in the boycott. The obligation to take these measures of force should be joint and several, so that while all the members are bound to act, one or more who are better prepared for action or in greater danger than the rest may proceed ahead of the others.

In order to secure world peace I would pile up the dangers and risks in front of an intending breaker of the moratorium. Should the rigors of maritime warfare be mitigated at the peace and a measure of freedom be restored to the seas in the direction contended for by President Wilson, I would advocate the power of full revival of all these rigors as against such a law-breaker. Not only the right of visit and search, but also of complete naval blockade should be exercisable against such a state. And the question requires careful consideration whether such a state should be accorded the status of legalized war, and whether it should not be outlawed and treated as the common criminal that it is. This would be a matter for the experts of the league to consider more fully in all its bearings. But in any case I would advocate a provision that any breaker of the moratorium should after the resulting war be subject to perpetual disarmament, that its forces should be reduced to a minimum basis, and that it should be subjected to a peaceful régime in the same way as new independent states recognized after this war in accordance with paragraph (8). The prospect of what will in effect be a permanent degradation and reduction in status as a Power will probably act as a strong deterrent to the intending evildoer. I therefore recommend:

> (19) That the peace treaty shall provide that if any member of the league breaks its covenant under paragraph (18), it shall *ipso facto* become at war with all the other members of the league, which shall subject it to complete economic and financial boycott, including the severance of all trade and financial relation and the prohibition of all intercourse between their subjects and the subjects of the covenant-breaking state, and the prevention, as far as possible, of the subjects of the covenant-breaking state from having any commercial or financial intercourse with the subjects of any other state, whether a member of the league or not.
>
> While all members of the league are obliged to take the above measures, it is left to the council to recommend what effective naval or military force the members shall contribute, and, if advisable, to absolve the smaller members of the league from making such contribution.
>
> The covenant-breaking state shall after the restoration of peace be subject to perpetual disarmament and to the peaceful régime established for new states under paragraph (8).

The actual treatment of the matter in dispute during the moratorium depends upon the classification of disputes into the two classes of justiciable and other disputes. Justiciable disputes are those which concern matters of fact or law which are capable of a legal or judicial handling. They involve mostly the interpretation of treaties or some other question of international law; or questions of fact, such as the situation of boundaries, or the amount of damage done by any breach of the law. The inquiry into such questions is exactly the province of courts of law, and disputes of this kind can therefore conveniently be referred to courts or arbitration tribunals of a judicial character, if they cannot be otherwise disposed of by negotiation. This treatment of international disputes has met with remarkable success in recent years, and has thus served to nip many a threatened war in the bud. Indeed, it may be said that the reference of justiciable cases to the decision of arbitral tribunals has become the common international practice. And the award of such tribunals has in almost all cases been carried out by the states against whom the decision was given, the exceptions being mostly confined to cases where the tribunal was accused of having exceeded its jurisdiction or admitted wrong evidence, or of other mistakes in procedure.

The real difficulty with regard to arbitration tribunals is to secure impartial arbitrators. The proposal has been made to create a permanent international tribunal or court, to which all justiciable cases may be referred by the council of the league. But the objection to this is that, as the judges on such a tribunal will be nationals of states, a state who appears as a litigant before the tribunal may feel aggrieved because a national of the opposing state may happen to be sitting in the case, and may be suspected of bias. On the whole, the most workable procedure seems to be to have a panel of arbitrators, to be prepared periodically by the council of the league, from which the litigants will select their respective arbitrators, and that if the arbitrators cannot agree as to the umpire, the nomination of the latter from the panel shall be left to the council, or to some other impartial authority indicated by the council for the purpose. I recommend:

> (20) That the peace treaty shall further provide that if a dispute should arise between any members of the league as to the interpretation of a treaty, or as to any question of international law, or as to any fact which if established would constitute a breach of any international obligation, or as to any damage alleged and the nature and measure of the reparation to be made therefor, and if such dispute cannot be settled by negotiation, the members bind themselves to submit the dispute to arbitration and to carry out any award or decision which may be rendered.

It may, however, be that the circumstances of the dispute are not of a justiciable nature. It may be that the council of the league, when they are appealed to to intervene in the matter, may be unable to decide whether it is a proper case for reference to an arbitration tribunal, or the minority may veto the appointment of an umpire about whom there cannot be an agreement otherwise, or for some reason or other a reference to arbitration may prove impacticable. In fact, we are here in the region of the most dangerous and intractable causes of war, where passions run high, not only among the disputants but also their partisans among other states. The issues are generally vague and intangible, and spring from special grounds of national psychology. They involve large questions of policy, of so-called vital interests, and of national honor. It is round these issues and questions that national and international passions gather like storm-clouds, until the thunder of war alone can clear the air again. They cannot be disposed of on judicial lines, and require entirely different treatment. They do, indeed, require careful inquiry into facts and allegations by the council and its expert committees; but, above all, they require that tactful diplomatic negotiation and conciliation between the disputants which great statesmen know best how to bring to bear on delicate and dangerous situations. Unlike arbitration on

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

definite issues of fact or law, the object in these cases is not to arrive at a definite decision, but to mediate between the parties with a view to an amicable or peaceful settlement of the dispute; and if that fails, then to prepare recommendations and statements which will inform and guide public opinion correctly as to the dispute and so enable it to mobilize its forces on the side of peace.

In all such cases, it ought to be free to either party to the dispute to appeal to the council of the league to take the matter of the dispute into consideration. In threatening cases it ought to be free to the council to intervene in the dispute on its own motion, without waiting for an application by one or other of the disputants. If applied to by one of the disputants the council will forthwith give notice of the application to the other disputant, and proceed to make the necessary arrangements for the hearing of the dispute. It may appoint expert committees to inquire into allegations of fact or law, the determination of which may assist in the settlement of the dispute. It should be the duty of all members of the league to place at the disposal of the council, or any committee appointed by it, to the fullest extent compatible with their interests, the information in their possession which bears upon the dispute. The functions of the council in connection with the dispute shall be two-fold: Firstly, to ascertain the facts with regard to the dispute, and to make recommendations based on the merits of the case, and calculated to ensure a just and lasting settlemen; and, secondly, to mediate and conciliate between the disputants with a view to inducing them to accept such recommendations.

The recommendations arrived at by the council will not have the force of decisions, and it will be free to either disputant to refuse to accept them and to go to war. It is even possible that the minority in the council is large enough to prevent any recommendations from being arrived at at all. If either party threatens to go to war in spite of the recommendations of the council, the latter will publish its recommendations in order to inform and guide public opinion in regard to the issues of the dispute. If, again, the council fails to agree on any recommendations, it will be even more necessary to place the public in a position to judge impartially of the questions at issue. In such a case it ought to be free both to the majority and the minority on the council to publish statements of their views of the dispute and the recommendations they favored but failed to pass in the council; and the publication of such statements should not be regarded as an unfriendly act by either of the disputants. The publication of these statements may, however, lead to such a crystallization of public opinion that even at the eleventh hour the parties are restrained from going to war. I therefore recommend:

> (21) That if on any ground it proves impracticable to refer such dispute to arbitration, either party to the dispute may apply to the council to take the matter of the dispute into consideration. The council shall give notice of the application to the other party, and make the necessary arrangements for the hearing of the dispute. The council shall ascertain the facts with regard to the dispute and make recommendations based on the merits, and calculated to secure a just and lasting settlement. Other members of the league shall place at the disposal of the council all information in their possession which bears on the dispute. The council shall do its utmost by mediation and conciliation to induce the disputants to agree to a peaceful settlement. The recommendations shall be addressed to the disputants and shall not have the force of decisions. If either party threatens to go to war in spite of the recommendations, the council shall publish its recommendations. If the council fails to arrive at recommendations, both the majority and the minority on the council may publish statements of the respective recommendations they favor, and such publication shall not be regarded as an unfriendly act by either of the disputants.

There remains for final consideration the case of a dispute in which one or both of the disputants happen to be outside the league. The treatment of such a dispute, however, will follow the lines above laid down. If one of the disputants is a member of the league it may apply to the council either for arbitration or a hearing, as the case may be. The council may then call on the outside state to submit its case; if it does so, the matter will proceed in accordance with the foregoing recommendations. If it fails to submit its case, the council may proceed to inquire into the dispute *ex parte*, and make recommendations in the same way as if both parties were present. If the disputant which is a member of the league is attacked during the moratorium or notwithstanding its compliance with the recommendations of the council by the outside state, the situation arising will be the same is if the attack had been made by a member of the league in the same circumstances, that is to say, the members of the league will become *ipso facto* at war with the outside state, against which the economic and financial boycott will be set in operation, and the council will proceed to organize the necessary military and naval forces.

In the case of a dispute between states, neither of which is a member of the league, any of the members may bring the matter before the council with a view to the council using its good offices to prevent war.

Any state which is not an original member of the league may apply to the council for admission. The council will give the application favorable consideration, and decide whether it should be granted, and whether it is necessary to impose any terms.

I have now come to the end of this short sketch of the league of nations. Whatever its imperfection, I hope it has shown that the project is not only workable, but necessary as an organ of the new world order now arising. If the future peace of the world is to be maintained, it will not be sufficient merely to erect an institution for the purpose of settling international disputes after they have arisen; it will be necessary to devise an instrument of government which will deal with the causes and sources of disputes. The need is there, and the end of the great war has brought an unqualled opportunity for dealing with it. For not only are men's minds prepared for the new peaceful order, but the sweeping away of the imperial systems of Europe leaves the space vacant which the new institution must occupy. The need, political and psychological, is imperative; the opportunity is unique; and only the blindness of statesmen could now prevent the coming of the new institution, which will, more than anything else, reconcile the peoples to the sufferings they have endured in this war. It will be the only fitting monument to our heroic dead. It will be the great response to the age-long cry from the human heart for "Peace on earth, goodwill among men." It will nobly embody and express the universal spirit which must heal the deep, self-inflicted wounds of humanity. And it must be the wise regulator, the steadying influence in the forward movement now set going among the nations of the earth.

For there is no doubt that mankind is once more on the move. The very foundations have been shaken and loosened, and things are again fluid. The tents have been struck, and the great caravan of humanity is once more on the march. Vast social and industrial changes are coming, perhaps upheavals which may, in their magnitude and effects, be comparable to war itself. A steadying, controlling, regulating influence will be required to give stability to progress, and to remove that wasteful friction which has dissipated so much social force in the past, and in this war more than ever before. These great functions could only be adequately fulfilled by the league of nations. Responding to such vital needs and coming at such a unique opportunity in history, it may well be destined to mark a new era in the government of man, and become to the peoples the guarantee of peace, to the workers of all races the great international, and to all the embodiment and living expression of the moral and spiritual unity of the human race.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

General Smuts's plan for the League of Nations which is issued this week as a supplement to *THE NATION*, will be reprinted, at an early date, in pamphlet form. This will be the only authorized and complete printing in America of General Smuts's plan—the present basis for all discussions of the League at the Peace Conference.

This pamphlet will be placed on sale at newsstands and bookstores throughout the country. Those desiring to order copies in large quantities should communicate promptly with

The Nation

20 Vesey Street New York

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED